		2
1	APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiffs:	Dotor II Wainbarger Egg
2	FOR the Plaintlis:	Peter H. Weinberger, Esq. Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Ste. 1700
3		1900 East Ninth Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114
4		216-696-3232
5		W. Mark Lanier, Esq. Rachel Lanier, Esq.
6		M. Michelle Carreras, Esq. Maria Fleming, Esq.
7		The Lanier Law Firm 6810 FM 1960 West
8		Houston, Texas 77069 813-659-5200
9		Frank L. Gallucci, III, Esq.
10		Plevin & Gallucci Company, LPA The Illuminating Building
11		Suite 2222 55 Public Square
12		Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-861-0804
13		Salvatore C. Badala, Esq.
14		Napoli Shkolnik 360 Lexington Ave., 11th Floor
15		New York, New York 10017 212-397-1000
16	For Walgreen Defendants:	Kaspar J. Stoffelmayr, Esq.
17	J	Brian C. Swanson, Esq. Katherine M. Swift, Esq.
18		Alex Harris, Esq. Sharon Desh, Esq.
19		Bartlit Beck LLP 54 West Hubbard Street, Ste.300
20		Chicago, Illinois 60654 312-494-4400
21	For CVS Defendants:	Graeme W. Bush, Esq.
22		Eric R. Delinsky, Esq. Alexandra W. Miller, Esq.
23		Paul B. Hynes, Jr., Esq. Zuckerman Spaeder - Washington
24		Suite 1000 1800 M Street, NW
25		Washington, DC 20036 202-778-1831

<b>O</b> 430. 1		3
1	For HBC/Giant Eagle	
2	Defendants:	Robert M. Barnes, Esq. Scott D. Livingston, Esq.
3		Marcus & Shapira 35th Floor
4		One Oxford Centre 301 Grant Street
5		Pittsburgh, PA 15219 412-471-3490
6		Diane P. Sullivan, Esq.
7		Chantale Fiebig, Esq. Weil Gotshal & Manges
8		Suite 600 2001 M Street NW
9		Washington, DC 20036 202-682-7200
10	For Walmart Defendants:	John M. Majoras, Esq.
11		Jones Day - Columbus Suite 600 325 John H. McConnell Blvd.
12		Columbus, Ohio 43215 614-281-3835
13		
14		Tara A. Fumerton, Esq. Tina M. Tabacchi, Esq. Jones Day - Chicago
15		Suite 3500 77 West Wacker
16		Chicago, Illinois 60601 312-782-3939
17		312 702 3939
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	(testing testing testing))
2	MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2021, 1:01 P.M.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon.
4	Please be seated.
13:01:53 5	Okay. I've been advised that all 14 jurors
6	are present so I assume both sides are ready to go.
7	MR. LANIER: Yes for plaintiffs, Your
8	Honor.
9	THE COURT: Is this better? Yeah, the
13:02:58 10	shield is no well, I'm far enough away, I'll take the
11	shield off.
12	Do we have some more chairs here? Someone
13	is bringing in some more chairs?
14	Okay. Let's bring in the jury, please,
13:03:18 15	then.
16	(Jury in.)
17	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
18	Please be seated.
19	All right. Good afternoon, ladies and
13:10:02 20	gentlemen. I hope you all had a good weekend.
21	Before we begin, I introduced you to the
22	lawyers last week.
23	At times, the parties, the two plaintiff
24	counties and the four defendant corporations, will have
13:10:19 25	party representatives in court.

1 I've made it optional so sometimes they'll 2 be here, sometimes not. If they're not here you're not 3 to draw no negative inference. This case is very 4 important to both counties and all four defendants. So I don't know if we have any party 13:10:39 5 6 representatives here. I thought we would start out as a 7 courtesy to introduce them. So, I guess, Mr. Lanier, if there are any representatives of either Lake or Trumbull 8 County. 13:10:53 10 MR. LANIER: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 May it please the Court. Your Honor, we 12 have a representative for both counties here today, 13 Ms. Kim Fraser. If you would stand up, please, Kim. 14 She's the Executive Director of the Lake 13:11:03 15 County, it's ADAM, it's Alcohol Drug Addiction and Mental 16 Health Board so we have Ms. Fraser here. 17 And Ms. Caraway is here from Trumbull 18 County and she's the Executive Director of the Mental 19 Health and Recovery Board, and they'll be here throughout 13:11:20 20 the trial, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lanier. 22 All right. Are there any defendant party 23 representatives? 2.4 MR. STOFFELMAYR: Yes, Your Honor. 13:11:26 25 Kaspar Stoffelmayr for Walgreen's, and we

have with us here Peter Wilson, who is one of the senior 1 2 lawyers in the Law Department at Walgreen's. 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Wilson. 4 Anyone else? 13:11:41 5 MR. DELINSKY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. 7 With us today is Andrea Zollett from CVS. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Zollett. 8 9 MS. SULLIVAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 13:11:55 10 Good afternoon, jurors. Thanks for coming in. Diane 11 Sullivan for Giant Eagle with Chantale Fiebig, also an 12 attorney working with me for Giant Eagle. And today we 13 have Emily Mooney from Painesville Ohio Pharmacy, a Giant 14 Eagle pharmacy in Lake County, and she's here 13:12:10 15 representing the company today. 16 A FEMALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon. 17 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Mooney. 18 MR. MAJORAS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 19 Good afternoon, folks. 13:12:18 20 My name is John Majoras. I'm one of the 21 lawyers for Walmart, and with us today is Mr. Roger 22 Schultheis. Mr. Schultheis is the Vice President of 23 Health and Wellness Operations at Walmart, which is 2.4 responsible for its pharmacy operations. 13:12:33 25 A MALE SPEAKER: Good afternoon.

1 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. 2 Okay. Members of the jury, now that you were sworn in last week, I want to give you some 3 4 preliminary instructions to guide you in your participation in this trial. 13:12:45 5 6 This is merely a summary and not the complete statement of the law that I'll give you at the 7 end of the case, which instructions will control your 8 deliberations and verdicts, and each of you will have a 13:12:59 10 copy of my final instructions. 11 But to help you follow the evidence, I'll 12 give you a brief summation of what plaintiffs must prove 13 to establish their claims. 14 First, however, it is my duty to give you what is called the admonition. This is a standing Court 13:13:13 15 16 order that applies throughout the trial. I will try to 17 remind you of the admonition at every recess, but if I 18 forget to remind you, it still applies. 19 Ladies and gentlemen, you have been 13:13:28 20 selected as jurors in this case. We've taken the time, a 21 lot of time last Wednesday and Thursday, to seat a 22 neutral jury so that this case can be decided just on 23 what goes on in this courtroom and not on any outside 2.4 influences.

You are required to decide this case based

13:13:43 25

solely on the evidence that is presented to you in this courtroom. It is my role as the Judge to determine what evidence is admissible and what is not admissible.

It would be a violation of your duties and unfair to the parties if you should obtain other information about the case which might be information that is not admissible as evidence.

You must carefully listen to all of the evidence, and evaluate all of it. Do not reach any conclusions until you have heard all the evidence, the arguments of the attorneys, and my final instructions of law. Otherwise, you will have an incomplete picture of this case.

Do not discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone outside the jury until the case is over, and do not discuss it at all outside of the jury deliberation room.

The reason for this is you might be given information or an opinion that could alter the way in which you view the evidence or the instructions or even how the case should come out.

Such an opinion or conclusion would be based on an incomplete or inaccurate view of the evidence, and, therefore, would be clearly unfair.

In addition, you absolutely must not try to

13:13:58 5

13:14:26 15

13:14:39 20

13:14:52 25

1 get information from any source outside the courtroom. 2 This ban on sources outside the courtroom applies to 3 information from all sources, such as family, friends, 4 the Internet, reference books, newspapers, magazines, TV, radio, an iPhone, Android, Blackberry, or other 13:15:12 5 6 Smartphone, iPad, and any other electronic device. 7 This ban on outside information also includes any personal investigation looking into news 8 9 accounts, talking to possible witnesses, reenacting the 13:15:31 10 allegations in the complaint, or any other act that would 11 otherwise affect the fairness and impartiality that you 12 must have as jurors. 13 If you see anything in the print media about this case, do not read it. If something on the TV 14 13:15:46 15 comes in about the case, change the channel. 16 This effort to exclude misleading 17 information and outside influences information also puts 18 a limit on getting legal information through TV 19 entertainment. 13:16:00 20 This would apply to popular TV shows, such 21 as Law and Order, Suits, Judge Judy, older shows such as 22 Boston Legal, Perry Mason or Matlock, and any other 23 fictional show dealing with the legal system. addition, this would apply to shows such as CSI and NCIS, 24 13:16:21 25 which use scientific procedures to resolve criminal

investigations.

13:17:39 25

13:17:21 20

13:17:08 15

13:16:33 5

13:16:49 10

This and other shows may leave you with an improper preconceived idea about our legal system.

As far as this case is concerned, you're not prohibited from watching such shows if you want to watch them. However, there are many reasons why you cannot rely on TV legal programs, including the fact that these shows, first, are not subject to the Rules of Evidence and legal safeguards that apply in this courtroom; and, second, they are works of fiction that present unrealistic situations for dramatic effect.

While they are or may be entertaining, TV legal dramas condense, distort, or even ignore many procedures that take place in real cases and real courtrooms. No matter how convincing they try to be, these shows simply cannot depict the reality of an actual trial or investigation.

You must put aside anything you think you know about the legal system that you saw or see on TV.

On top of legal dramas, there are also TV programs specifically related to opioid addiction in the United States. News programs, such as 60 Minutes, have broadcasted segments on this topic. If you have seen any such programs, you are not to consider them during this trial.

Additionally, on or about the second week of this trial, Hulu will be releasing a mini series called, "Dope Sick," about opioid addiction. You are instructed to avoid this and similar programs throughout the duration of the trial and to not consider any such programming during your deliberations. Finally, you must not have contact with

anyone about this case other than the Judge and Court employees. This includes sending or receiving e-mail, Twitter, text messages or other updates using blogs and chat rooms and the use of Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, and other social media sites of any kind regarding this case or any aspect of your jury service during the trial.

Again, you're not prohibited from using any of these sources, devices, channels of communication, whatever, but you are prohibited from using them in any way about the trial, what you see, what you hear.

If anyone tries to contact you about this case directly or indirectly, do not allow that person to have contact with you. If any person persists in contacting you or speaking with you, that could be jury tampering, which is a very serious crime. If anyone contacts you in this manner, report this to my Courtroom Deputy as quickly as possible.

And I want to add, you may encounter some

1

21

22 23

24

13:19:00 25

1 of the lawyers, some of the party representatives outside 2 the courtroom, in the restroom, whatever. If you see 3 them, they're going to walk away, they're not going to 4 talk to you, and your first reaction is they're being 13:19:19 5 rude. They're not being rude. They're under 6 7 strict orders not to talk to you. And you may say what's wrong with saying hi or good morning or good afternoon. 8 Obviously nothing's wrong with that, but that could lead 13:19:29 10 to a response or someone could see them talking to you 11 and that could be a big problem. 12 So they're not being impolite. They're just following Court orders and you should do the same. 13 14 You should know that if this admonition is violated, there could be a mistrial. A mistrial means 13:19:42 15 16 that the case is stopped before it's finished and must be 17 retried at a later date. 18 This can lead to a great deal of expense 19 for the parties and for taxpayers; namely, you and your 13:19:56 20 neighbors. No one wants to see money, especially tax 21 dollars, wasted. If a mistrial were to be declared based 22 on a violation of this admonition, the juror responsible 23 could be required to pay the cost of the first trial and 24 could also be punished for contempt of court.

It will be your duty to find from the

13:20:11 25

evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the
Judges of the facts. You will then have to apply those
facts to the law as I will give you and I'm summarizing
now, and I'll give more detailed instructions at the end
of the case.

You must follow that law whether you agree
with it or not.

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

13:21:25 25

13:21:11 20

13:21:00 15

13:20:41 10

Nothing that I may say or do during this trial is intended to indicate, nor should be taken by you as indicating, what your verdict should be. The evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts the lawyers agree or stipulate to or that I instruct you to find.

Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you. I'll list them for you now.

Statements, arguments and questions by the lawyers are not evidence. The answers of the witnesses are the evidence. The questions are not.

Objections to questions are not evidence. Lawyers have an obligation to their client to make an objection when they believe evidence being offered is improper under the Rules of Evidence or whether a question is objectionable. These objections serve to

help me.

13:22:42 25

13:22:28 20

13:22:13 15

13:21:40 5

13:21:58 10

The purpose of objections is to ensure the presentation of evidence that is proper and to keep out all irrelevant matters. As jurors, you should not hold objections against either party or feel that either side is trying to keep something from you. And you should not be influenced by my — by the objection or by my ruling on it. If the objection is sustained, just ignore the question. And the lawyer will ask another one. If it's overruled, treat the answer like any other. If you're instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

And if an objection is made and I feel I need to hear a little more from the lawyers, and it's going to be relatively short, what we're all going to do, we're going to put on our headphones, there will be some white noise and we'll be having a brief conversation about that, and I'll make my legal ruling. Then we'll take our headphones off and then the examination of the witness will continue.

And that's a quick way so we can handle things outside of the presence of the jury but do it in a safe way. Before COVID, we would all sort of huddle up at the side-bar, but obviously no one is doing that, so we're using the headphones.

1 Testimony that I exclude or tell you to 2 disregard is not evidence and must not be considered. 3 All right. Delays during trial should not 4 be considered by you or held against any party. When a 13:23:04 5 case on trial is recessed or adjourned and the trial 6 doesn't commence right at the designated time, the delay 7 most likely is caused by either something I had to do on this case that had to be done right then, or some 8 emergency on one of my other many, many cases. I'm going 13:23:23 10 to try to avoid those as much as possible, but over six, 11 seven weeks, it's likely that something of an emergency 12 nature will come up. 13 So don't hold it against either side. Hold 14 it against me. And don't feel that your time is being 13:23:35 15 wasted. 16 Again, as I said in my admonition, anything 17 you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not 18 evidence and you must disregard it. You as jurors must decide this case based 19 13:23:51 20 solely on the evidence presented right here within the 21 four walls of this courtroom. This means that during the 22 trial, you must not conduct any independent research 23 about this case, the matters in the case, the individuals

or corporations involved in the case.

In other words, you should not consult

2.4

13:24:04 25

1 dictionaries or reference materials, such as the 2 Internet, websites, blogs, or use any other electronic 3 tools, such as Smartphones and iPads, to obtain 4 information about this case or to help you decide this 13:24:19 5 case. I know it's hard. We all use them. 6 7 you just cannot do it. So don't try to find out any information from any source outside the confines of this 8 9 courtroom. 13:24:29 10 All right. There are two kinds of 11 evidence: There's direct evidence, there's 12 circumstantial evidence. 13 Direct evidence is simply evidence, like 14 the testimony of an eyewitness, which, if you believe it, 13:24:42 15 directly proves a fact. 16 For example, if a witness testified that he 17 saw it raining outside, and you believed him, that would 18 be direct evidence it was raining. 19 Circumstantial evidence, by contrast, is 13:24:54 20 simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly proves a 21 fact. If someone walks into the courtroom wearing a 22 raincoat covered with drops of water and carrying a wet 23 umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from 2.4 which you could conclude that it was raining outside. 13:25:09 25 I'm going to give you further instructions

1 on these, as well as other matters, at the end of the 2 case, but keep in mind that there's no legal difference 3 between direct or circumstantial evidence. One is not 4 better than the other. You should consider both kinds of 13:25:24 5 evidence. 6 I'm sure you're going to hear the lawyers talk about the credibility or the believability of 7 witnesses. These words mean the same thing. Part of 8 your job as jurors is to decide how believable each 13:25:36 10 witness is. That's your job, it's not mine. 11 It's up to you to decide if a witness's 12 testimony is believable and how much weight you think it 13 deserves. You're free to believe everything that a 14 witness says, or only part of it, or none of it at all, 13:25:52 15 but you should, of course, act reasonably and carefully 16 in making those decisions. 17 Let me suggest some things for you to 18 consider in evaluating each witness's testimony. 19

First, ask yourself if the witness was able to clearly see or hear the events. Sometimes even an honest witness may not have been able to clearly see or hear what was happening and might make a mistake.

13:26:05 20

21

22

23

2.4

13:26:19 25

Next, ask yourself how good the witness' memory seems to be. Does the witness seem able to accurately remember what happened?

1 Next, ask yourself how the witness looks and acts while testifying. Does the witness seem honest 2 3 in trying to tell you what happened, or does the witness 4 seem to be lying? 13:26:30 5 Next, ask yourself if the witness has any 6 relationship to either side of the case or anything to 7 gain or lose that might influence the witness' testimony. Does the witness have any bias, prejudice, or reason for 8 testifying that might cause him or her to lie or to slant 13:26:47 10 testimony in favor of one side or the other? 11 Ask yourself if the witness testifies 12 inconsistently while on the witness stand or if the 13 witness says or does anything off the stand that is 14 inconsistent with what the witness said while testifying. 13:27:02 15 If you believe that the witness is inconsistent, ask 16 yourself if this makes the witness' testimony less 17 believable. Sometimes it may. Other times it may not. 18 Consider whether the inconsistency is about 19 something important, or about some unimportant detail. 13:27:19 20 Ask yourself if it seems like an innocent mistake, or if it seems deliberate. 21 22 Finally, ask yourself how believable the 23 witness' testimony is in light of all the other evidence. 2.4 Is the witness' testimony supported or contradicted by 13:27:34 25 other evidence that you find believable?

1 If you believe that a witness' testimony is 2 contradicted by other evidence, remember that people 3 sometimes forget things, and that even two honest people 4 who witness the same event may not describe it in exactly 13:27:48 5 the same way. 6 These are only some of the things that you 7 may consider in deciding how believable each witness is. You may also consider other things that you think shed 8 some light on the witness' believability. Use your 13:28:03 10 common sense and your everyday experience in dealing with 11 other people, and then decide what testimony you believe 12 and how much weight you think it deserves. 13 During the trial, it's possible that I may 14 ask questions of a witness to bring out facts not then fully covered in the testimony. Please do not assume 13:28:19 15 16 that I hold any opinion on the matters to which my 17 questions may have related. Remember, that you, as 18 jurors, are at liberty to disregard all of my comments or 19 questions in arriving at your own factual findings. 13:28:34 20 I want to touch on burden of proof, and 21 this was mentioned, I think, during jury selection. 22 In a civil action like this case, the 23 burden of proof on the plaintiffs is by a preponderance

of the evidence. To establish something by a

preponderance of the evidence means to prove that

2.4

13:28:52 25

something is more likely true than not.

13:30:03 25

13:29:49 20

13:29:37 15

13:29:06 5

13:29:24 10

Another term for "Preponderance of the evidence" is greater weight of the evidence. If you want to think of a teeter totter, it's just enough evidence to tip it to one side or the other as opposed to completely level.

This standard does not require proof to an absolute certainty since proof to an absolute certainty is seldom possible in any case or it doesn't require proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That's the proof we require in a criminal case.

This is a civil case. Preponderance of the evidence, just remember, like a teeter totter, the plaintiffs have to put in enough evidence that tips that teeter totter towards their side.

In determining whether any fact in issue has been proved by a preponderance of the evidence, you may, unless otherwise instructed, consider the testimony of all witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and all exhibits received in evidence, regardless of who may have produced them.

The plaintiffs in this case, as you know, are Lake County and Trumbull County. There are four defendants, three of which are national pharmacy chains and one of which is a regional pharmacy chain.

13:31:27 25

13:31:09 20

13:30:56 15

13:30:22 5

13:30:39 10

The defendants are in alphabetical order CVS, HBC Giant Eagle, Walgreen's and Walmart.

The four pharmacy defendants each bought prescription opioids from pharmaceutical manufacturers and then distributed those prescription opioids to their pharmacy stores or bought and received prescription opioids from other distributors.

The pharmacy stores then used these opioids to fill prescriptions for patients written by doctors and other health care practitioners.

The pharmacy defendants each played two related roles during their business dealings with prescription opioids. One is a distributor and one is dispenser. First, they acted as a distributor when they bought opioids from manufacturers or other third-party distributors and then distributed the drugs to their own pharmacy stores.

Second, they acted as a dispenser when their pharmacy stores filled prescriptions for patients.

The two counties, Lake County and Trumbull County, allege that each pharmacy defendant failed to monitor, detect, investigate, report, and stop certain suspicious shipments and illegitimate prescriptions of opioids which allowed the opioids to be diverted to illegal use.

1 The counties allege these suspicious 2 shipments and illegitimate prescriptions caused a public 3 nuisance, which is defined as an ongoing substantial 4 interference with the public health in their counties. The pharmacy defendants deny the counties' 13:31:40 5 6 claims that they caused a public nuisance. 7 defendants contend that they complied with their legal obligations, violated no duties, and that if a public 8 nuisance exists today in these two counties, it was 13:31:56 10 caused by persons other than the pharmacy defendants. 11 I will give you detailed instructions on 12 the law at the end of the case, and those instructions 13 will control your deliberations and decision. But to help you follow the evidence, I will 14 13:32:10 15 now give you a brief summary of what plaintiffs must 16 prove in order to establish their claim. 17 Note that my summary of -- note that my 18 summary of the claim -- in my summary of the claim, I 19 will use the word "Person" or "Persons." 13:32:26 20 Please bear in mind that for this claim, 21 corporations are considered persons. 22 A public nuisance is an unreasonable 23 interference with a right held by the public in common. 2.4 A public nuisance includes an unreasonable interference 13:32:42 25 with public health or public safety.

A right common to the general public is a

right or an interest that belongs to the community at

large. It is a right that is collective in nature. A

public right is different from an individual right that

everyone has, like the right not to be assaulted or

defrauded.

For a defendant to be held liable for

For a defendant to be held liable for creating a public nuisance, a plaintiff must show by the greater weight of the evidence that the defendant did one or both of the following two things:

One, the defendant engaged in intentional conduct that caused a significant and ongoing interference with a public right to health or safety; or, two, that the defendant engaged in unlawful conduct that caused a significant and ongoing interference with a public right to health or safety.

For this claim, the plaintiffs must prove that the conduct of one or more defendants was a substantial factor in creating an ongoing public nuisance.

And remember, you must consider the evidence against each of the four defendants separately, and you'll be asked to make a separate decision at the end of the case.

This concludes the summary of the law that

8

9

13:33:10 10

19

17

18

22

21

2.4

23

13:33:53 25

will help quide you as you hear the evidence.

Now, a few words about your conduct as jurors. Again, first, during the trial, you are not to discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to even attempt to discuss it with you or in your presence.

As to anyone who you may come to recognize as having some connection with this case, such as the attorneys, the parties, the witnesses or members of my staff, to avoid even the appearance of impropriety, you should have no conversation whatsoever with them while you're serving on the jury.

If you see any of these people in the hall, the elevator, stairway, on the street, just ignore them. They will understand that you are not being impolite but you're obeying my instructions. They've also been given the same instructions.

The point of this is that if someone sees you talking with anyone connected with this case, even if you're only exchanging greetings, the Court may have to hold a hearing to find out what was said and that becomes cumbersome. So just don't have any conversation whatsoever with anyone connected with this case. Do not discuss this case with anyone. Obviously if you have a question or an issue, you'll see either Mr. Pitts or Ms. King. You can ask them and they will communicate

13:35:09 25

with me.

13:36:24 25

13:36:05 20

13:35:52 15

13:35:21 5

13:35:37 10

All right. If anyone tries to communicate with you outside of this jury room, the courthouse or whatever, bring it to the Court's attention promptly.

Again, you've got to decide this case solely on the evidence presented here. You are not to conduct any independent research, reading or investigation about this case.

Don't listen or read anything, anything touching on this case in any way. Consult dictionaries or reference material, anything on on the Internet, social media whatsoever to help you decide it.

Everything you need to know, you're going to see and hear right here. So if you come across an article that you think is touching on the case, just put it aside. Read it after the trial.

And until you retire to deliberate, you may not discuss this case with anyone, even your fellow jurors, because once you start discussing the case, you're going to start forming conclusions and it's unfair to the plaintiffs, it's unfair to the defendants to reach conclusions until you've heard all of the evidence.

So again, don't form any conclusion or form opinions as to whether the plaintiff has met its burden at all until all the case is open -- is closed and ended.

13:37:39 25

13:37:25 20

13:37:10 15

13:36:39 5

13:36:55 10

So keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

In my courtroom, I allow jurors to take notes. You've got notepads. If you wish, you may take notes. If you don't take — if you do take notes, please leave them in the jury room when you go home at night. These notes are for your own personal use and will not be distributed or read by anyone else for any purpose. After the trial is concluded, they'll be destroyed.

And we do this, some people, it helps their memory and recollection to take notes. I'm one of those. But for some people, it's a distraction. So you know what works best for you, and if you want to take notes, fine. If you don't want to, that's fine.

All right. The trial is now going to begin. First, plaintiffs will make an opening statement, which is simply an outline to help you understand the evidence as it comes in.

Next, defendants will make an opening statement and you will hear from some or all of them.

Opening statements are neither evidence, nor arguments. Since plaintiffs have the burden of proof, the plaintiffs go first and they will present their witnesses and physical evidence. And counsel for the defendants will cross-examine those witnesses.

2.4

13:39:00 25

13:38:46 20

13:38:28 15

13:37:52 5

13:38:14 10

Then it will be the defendants' turn, and they'll present witnesses and physical evidence, and then the plaintiffs may present a short rebuttal case, rebuttal testimony and evidence.

In my courtroom, I allow jurors to ask questions, but this is how I work it. We have direct testimony and then cross, cross-examination. And after the cross-examination, if any of you has a proposed question, just write it down on one of the slips of paper in your notebook, tear it out and give it to the Courtroom Deputy, either Mr. Pitts or Ms. King, and she'll give the question to me.

I'm going to look at it and then I'm going to show it to the lawyers for both sides for their review. The attorneys may choose to ask the question of that witness when they conduct further questions, or they may not. If they decide not to ask the question, don't hold it against anyone. It may be because the answer sought, it isn't relevant to this case, or counsel may believe that the question can best be answered by questioning another witness, and the lawyers know which other witnesses are coming and they may say, "All right, this is a good question but I'm going to ask it of a following witness, not this witness."

So it's to let the lawyers know that you've

got a question. So I'll remember to do that, but if I forget and you have a question after cross-examination, just raise your hand and I will address it.

After all the evidence is presented, I'm going to instruct you on the law, and then the attorneys will present their closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence for you. And after that, you will retire to deliberate on your verdicts.

So we're going to start with the opening statements of the plaintiffs. I plan to take a mid-morning -- mid afternoon break around 3:00 o'clock. I don't expect we're going to finish all of the opening statements today. We'll finish those up tomorrow. And when they're concluded, then the plaintiffs will call their first witness.

So I believe Mr. Lanier is going to do the opening for the plaintiffs, so Mr. Lanier.

13:41:26 25

13:41:07 20

13:40:49 15

13:39:56 5

13:40:37 10

## OPENING STATEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF

MR. LANIER: Thank you, Your Honor.

And may it please this Court, ladies and gentlemen, first, Ms. Court Reporter, can you hear me?

Is this little mic working? And it's not working. Is it working when I hold it up here? This will be interesting.

All right. I will try to raise my volume level to make it more suitable for you and try not to blast all of y'all out of here.

My name is Mark Lanier and I'm really delighted to get to try this case before you. I've got several people with me that you sort of met, but I need to give you a little more introduction.

So I'll start here with Ms. Maria Fleming, and Maria is a local lawyer who is here. She helps represent Lake and Trumbull Counties. She's fantastic. I need her here because she keeps up with my exhibits and that becomes really critical in this case so if you see me huddling with her, you'll know what it's about.

Sal Badala is the next lawyer here. Sal is also — we don't let Sal talk because he's from New York and I'm from Texas, they barely let me talk but, no, Sal is a marvelous lawyer from New York who happens to also represent these counties.

1 And you met Ms. Fraser and Ms. Caraway. 2 You have not met Frank Gallucci, who is a local lawyer and Frank represents the counties as well, and so thank 3 4 you for being here. 13:41:38 5 Again, Ms. Caraway -- I did Ms. Fraser. 6 I'm saving you. 7 Pete Weinberger is a local lawyer as well. In fact, his office is right down the street and he's 8 9 here to make sure I don't mess up. 13:41:52 10 So if he's talking to me, you know I've 11 done something wrong. 12 He may take a witness or two in this trial 13 as well, especially if I'm messing up that bad. So I 14 want you to know it's an honor to get to try the case 13:42:06 15 with him. 16 And last, I want to introduce Rachel 17 Lanier. You might see me hug on her. Don't think I've 18 married someone young enough to be my daughter. She's 19 not my wife, she is my daughter, and it's a joy to get to 13:42:21 20 try this case with my daughter. And if I'm talking to 21 her, you'll understand either my shirt is untucked or 22 she's saying some things that only a daughter could say 23 to me and nobody else could. 24 So that's our team that we've got here and 13:42:34 25 we're honored to be here but we couldn't make it without

Juan Wilson. Juan is sitting back here. Mr. Wilson has worked with us for 20 years or so. He works all the audio/visual.

He's not a lawyer but the Court has graciously allowed him to sit on this side of the bar so that I can switch back and forth between computers and IPs and get the best job I can of communicating to you because that's my role.

My role in this trial is to set forward for you the evidence so that you can do your job and make a determination of whether or not these companies individually have responsibility for the public nuisance in this case.

And so I represent Lake and Trumbull

Counties against these companies, and the case itself is about the distribution and the dispensing of opioids.

Now, you've got screens all around you. You've got screens over there, you've got screens over there, you have a screen right here, the Judge has a monitor, the same thing the lawyers do. The reason why is because we think it helps communicate.

There will be times during the trial where it will also show evidence because some of the evidence is in documents. It's not all just what people say.

But the case itself is about the

13:42:48 5

13:43:39 20

13:43:51 25

13:45:22 25

13:44:59 20

13:44:44 15

13:44:10 5

13:44:29 10

distribution and dispensing of opioids, not just in Ohio but it's expansive, as you'll hear.

You know, we've got counties that are close to the border of Pennsylvania. We've got counties that are on a highway up from Florida. So you're going to hear different testimony about all of this, but the key is, is there a nuisance in Lake and Trumbull Counties and then you have to figure out if there is, indeed, a nuisance. And nuisance is not in the everyday sense of, you know, my kid sister was a nuisance growing up.

No. Nuisance in this sense is an intrusion in the public right to just enjoy life within the communities in some ways. The Judge will give you a real specific instruction.

But then the question becomes are these companies, any of these companies or all of them, a substantial contributing factor in creating this nuisance?

Now, let me be very clear from the very beginning, I believe the evidence will show you that there's a boatload of people responsible. As I indicated in jury selection, it's voir dire in His Honor's Court. Where I come from we call it voir dire because we don't speak French in Texas, but when we were asking questions, I specifically asked you, you know, do you understand the

1 idea that there might be lots of people involved in 2 creating a problem of this magnitude. And I think that's 3 what you're going to hear from the evidence. 4 This opening statement is just my roadmap. This is me telling you how this evidence is going to 13:45:38 5 6 unfold in the trial based upon my best understanding. 7 So I'll talk to you about some of the witnesses. That doesn't mean that everyone that I'm 8 9 going to put on the stand I've talked about. I may have 13:45:54 10 to add some. The Judge has got us on a clock, and so 11 I've only got 75 hours to do my case and my 12 cross-examination, barring something unforetold, and so I 13 may have to delete some witnesses. I may have to change 14 some things. 13:46:11 15 But this is my best estimate of how it's 16 going to go down right now at this moment. 17 Now, during this COVID time, my daughter 18 introduced me to a word that I should have known before 19 evidently but I didn't. It's "Binge watching." Binge watching is evidently watching the same -- a show one 13:46:28 20 21 after the other until your eyeballs want to explode or 22

> And I thought since I've learned how to binge watch -- and, yes, I've been quilty. I've binge watched on Netflix, I've binge watched on Amazon Prime --

something.

23

24

13:46:45 25

1 I thought I might use that as a theme to keep you awake 2 for the two-and-a-half hours His Honor has given me to 3 address you today. 4 You say, "Oh, mercy, two-and-a-half hours of that quy?" Sorry. That's the way it's coming down. 13:47:02 5 6 And I'm going to do the best I can. 7 But we're going to do it based on my idea of binge watching. You're really just going to get three 8 9 episodes or something. I mean just think of the time, 13:47:18 10 okay, two-and-a-half hours, we can binge watch that long. 11 So our binge watching show, though, is not 12 Netflix, it's not Amazon Prime, it's a bunch of witnesses 13 that are going to be coming out. 14 And when I binge watch, I do it in three 13:47:32 15 different ways or there's three aspects to binge 16 watching, I should say. 17 Number one, I want to hear about it. I 18 want to hear about whatever it is I'm going to watch 19 because some things sound pretty good, some things 13:47:44 20 frankly don't. There are some things that my wife and I 21 enjoy watching. There are some things that I'd rather 22 watch and she's just not into. 23 So I want to hear about the show, see if 2.4 it's one I'm into. 13:47:55 25 Second thing is that I watch it. And when

1 I'm done, I tell other people about it. I'll say, "Hey, 2 this is a great show, you need to watch it, " or, "Hey, 3 this show is terrible, don't watch it," or, you know, 4 we'll discuss it, which character reminds you of what. So those three ideas are the way I've 13:48:12 5 6 structured my opening statement for you. As I tell you 7 how the evidence will come in, I'm going to do it by talking about the episodes, and then I'm going to watch 8 9 them with you, and then we'll talk about them at the end. 13:48:28 10 So here we go. Let's start with "hear 11 about it." 12 If I had a title for this show, I would title the show, "Opioid Epidemic." I would tell you this 13 14 is a nonfiction show. By that, I mean it's a documentary. This is real, this is truth, this isn't 13:48:45 15 16 made-up, it's not fairy tail. The Judge talked about 17 different TV shows that are to be distinct from the 18 courtroom. Those are little 30-minute, maybe 45-minute, 19 maybe an hour episodes that contain everything 13:49:04 20 soup-to-nuts. They're fake. 21 This is not one of those shows. This is 22 the real thing. 23 You're going to actually -- this is why it 24 takes seven weeks or six weeks or however long His Honor 13:49:17 25 will give us. But this is why. Because you get it and

you get it with the Rules of Evidence that make America what it is and make our court system what it is.

You're going to learn about opioids more than you ever dreamed, although some of you from your training probably have a pretty good grasp of things already. But you'll hear about drugs we're especially concentrating on; Hydrocodone, which is one of dozens of different types of opiates, and you'll also hear about Oxycodone, which is another one of a group.

Now, when we talk about what opiates are and opioids, it includes a range of legal drugs like Hydrocodone and Oxycodone but there are also illegal opiate drugs. So, for example, heroin is an opiate drug and heroin's been around for a long time. But it's an opiate. It happens to be illegal in the United States, but it's still an opiate.

There's another one that the medical science in a sense has almost even invented. It's called Fentanyl. And Fentanyl is this mega powerful opiate that typically is prescribed when someone is at end stage of cancer, and the pain is just unbearable.

But Fentanyl is a drug that can be legal but there's also a street Fentanyl which is illegal. And we'll hear about all of this.

What makes them opiates? They come from

13:49:59 10

13:49:32 5

13:50:21 15

13:50:41 20

13:51:00 25

the poppy plant. Now, not this pretty little poppy plant here. You might could get something from it, but this is the kind you can even plant in your garden here in America, and they don't let you plant the kind that's going to turn you into a dope dealer here so this is just the pretty one.

The one we're concerned about here is the one that goes by the name Papaver somniferum. Somniferum from the Latin word for put me to sleep and Papaver is the poppy.

And this is the opium poppy. This is what it looks like. And what happens with the opium poppy is, after the petals fall off, you've got this bulb or head up at the top and then it looks like a little crown on top of the head. And if you took a knife or some sharp object and you sliced into that bulb, a latex or a fluid would come out. And it's from that fluid that you get these opiates.

Now, we're not the first people to figure this out. This has been around for a long time. You can go back and find ancient Sumerians. The Sumerians were over in the Middle East and their empire was over in Mesopotamia between the Tigres and the Euphrates over in the Iraq area. But you can go back thousands of years in B.C. and read about their use of the opium plant and the

13:51:28 10

13:52:32 25

latex, the fluid that came out of it. They called it hul gill.

And I say that very boldly. We don't really know how to pronounce the cuneiform script that they had, but that's the scholar's best estimate. I can tell you that it translates to the happy plant because that's what they thought of it.

And they even would shape some of their jugs to look like it. You say how does that look like it? Well, if you took that poppy plant and you turned it upside down, you'd see how these jugs look like it.

I was able to get a place to release the Sumerian poppy jug for you, and it's exactly what it was. And they had ridges built into the pot so they could rub the latex and they would put the opium residue in with wine and it made a good sleeping potion.

I'll tell you, if you go back to Roman times, the Romans -- I've put a vase here. Let me pull this out. This is actually a Greek vase, the Greek gods Thanatos is the Greek word for death. Thanatos was the Greek god of death. He had a half brother. His half brother was the god of sleep. His name is Hupnos. If you get Hupnotized, you're put to sleep.

Hupnos and Thanatos wore poppy seeds around their head or poppy plants in the wreath because the

13:52:50 5

13:53:02 10

13:53:24 15

13:53:47 20

13:54:06 25

13:55:45 25

13:55:21 20

13:55:00 15

13:54:24 5

13:54:43 10

medicine or the latex or the sap was used, not just to help people sleep, make people happy, but also suicide was not illegal then, also used especially among the older people as a way to choose when you die because it will stop your breathing.

So opium's been around for a long time.

You can chart through the -- it's referenced in the

Bible. There's a Hebrew word Rosh, which means head, and

Rosh is used for a bitter plant. But a lot of scholars,

Gasineus I think, and others, believe that that plant is

referencing -- it's translated bitter gall sometimes,

sometimes bitter root, but it's referencing the same

plant, the opioid plant.

So you've got this. You can bring it into English times. You can take this book that really hit the market in 1822, '23, Confession of an Opium Eater, and it just talked about how this opium was so destructive to the person who was eating it and biographing it.

You've got the Chinese opium dens in the 1870s; huge problem. Heavens, you've got beyond that the Wizard of Oz. I mean Dorothy, you know, "I'll get you my pretty," and all that stuff. The Wizard of Oz, the book, not the movie. The book talks about this. I don't remember the movie that much. Maybe the movie does as

well.

13:57:10 25

13:56:51 20

13:56:32 15

13:55:56 5

13:56:13 10

I've got the book here but I've put it into the PowerPoint. If this is working good enough, I'll throw it up here for you to read it along with me. Look at this passage. You'll see the illustrator used the pretty poppies, didn't use the real ones that have the opium in the high enough concentration to make a difference, but it says, "So they kept walking until Dorothy could stand no longer." She's walking among the poppies. "Her eyes closed in spite of herself and she forgot where she was and she fell among the poppies fast asleep."

It continues, "If we leave here, she will die, said the Lion. The smell of the flowers is killing us all. I myself can scarcely keep my eyes open and the dog is asleep already."

So this is the idea that this was well-known, such that Frank Baum writes about it in his book, "Run fast said the Scarecrow to the Lion and get out of the deadly flower bed as soon as you can."

There's a Journal of Neurology and an abstract was published in the Journal. This just came out in 2019, but in the abstract, it talks about an 8,000-year history of use and abuse of opium and opioids. How that matters for a successful control of the

1 epidemic.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

13:58:47 25

13:58:28 20

13:58:05 15

13:57:26 5

13:57:45 10

And here's what the writer said. He said "8,000-year-old hardened Sumerian clay tablets are the earliest prescriptions of opium." You already knew that because I told you that earlier.

"Ancient Greeks, Indians, Chinese,
Egyptians, Romans, Arabs, people in the middle ages,
Europeans from Renaissance to now knew opium as an
ever-approved, next-door medicine, a panacea for all
maladies."

References in the odyssey of the Bible, and use by known leaders and minds like Homer, Franklin,

Napoleon, have removed the label of immortality -- or immorality from its use."

"Recognition of subjective pain is the fifth vital sign, with pressure on providers to prescribe scheduled medicines, added additional strokes to this menace of pre-historic dimensions, the opioid epidemic, which shreds 13 percent high school seniors every year."

And one of the main reasons this happens is some people are especially prone and become addicted to opioids.

You will hear the evidence in this case from Dr. Anna Lembke. Now, I think she's going to be my second witness. That's my plan right now. My plan, my

1 very first witness is actually going to be a gentleman 2 that works for the defendants, works for CVS, Mr. Tom 3 Davis, and we'll start with him because I want to 4 challenge him on some of the things about CVS. 5 I want you to hear that challenge fresh 13:59:04 6 from hearing the CVS opening statement and that of the 7 other lawyers. So he'll be my first witness. But Anna Lembke, Dr. Lembke, will be my 8 9 next. Now, she -- you may have heard her podcast. She 13:59:20 10 did podcasts on Drug Dealer, M.D. and that was before she 11 came out with a book which has just been published, Drug 12 Dealer, M.D. How Doctors Were Duped, Patients Got 13 Hooked, and Why It's So Hard to Stop." 14 Dr. Lembke is at Stanford University. 13:59:36 15 She's a psychiatrist, a medical doctor, psychiatrist, and 16 an addiction specialist. 17 And I'm going to ask her to come in here 18 and to testify about how addiction works. The domino 19 effect of prescription drugs to illegal drugs; not -- I'll explain it in more detail. 13:59:57 20 There's a misused -- no, a multi-used 21 22 phrase that we'll talk about, about the gateway effect. 23 And it's not valid in the sense of, I think it's been 24 disproven in the sense of gee, you smoke a cigarette so 14:00:14 25 pretty soon, you're going to be mainlining heroin.

That's not it.

And this, some people use the language here "gateway effect" but it's a different concept. This is one opiate leads to another opiate to another opiate.

It's within that family.

But she'll talk about how that domino effect has worked even into illegal drugs, and the role that pharmacies have played in this.

I think it's easy for all of us to look at the manufacturers of these medicines, like Perdue Pharma and say, "Hey, you played a significant part because you told everybody you invented a drug that wasn't addictive and it was addictive and you told everybody to prescribe this for pain when it shouldn't be prescribed."

I don't think any of the parties are going to fuss that. I don't think any of the parties are going to fuss that not everybody did their jobs right and there are lots of different parts to this. But you'll be stunned to find out, I suspect some of you at least, the role the pharmacies play. And you'll hear about that.

But some of it will come from Dr. Lembke. She will talk about the pleasure/pain balance, how a normal dopamine level allows somebody to balance between pleasure and pain and how important it is that we maintain that balance and how the infiltration into our

14:00:26 5

14:00:42 10

14:00:58 15

\_

14:01:33 25

bloodstream across the blood brain barrier into the brain affects that.

Because human beings are designed to seek out pleasure. They're designed to avoid pain. And when you've got a drug that manipulates your brain and changes that balance, it does dangerous things to you and to me.

So I've told you about the history of this. Before we get to the second point that I need in opening, let me talk to you a little bit more and tell you how the United States has handled this historically.

Pre-1914, it was the wild west. It was anything goes. It's just like the TV shows where the fellow takes his carriage out into the wild west town and stands up and starts hocking his Uncle Joe's medicine, good for whatever ails you. You buy a fifth of whiskey for a dollar but if you pay two dollars, you'll get his medicine. And people would buy it and he could put opium in it, he could put anything he wanted to in it. It was pretty wide open here in the U.S.

And as a result, there were problems. So in December of 1914, the United States passed something called the Harrison Act. And the Harrison Act was just designed to try to get some handle on some of these drugs that were destructive to Americans.

Among those drugs were some opiates. And

14:02:15 10

14:01:55 5

14:02:54 20

14:03:13 25

1 so, for example, you can still find on eBay and other 2 places heroin tablets that were subject to the Harrison 3 Act. Here's hypodermic tablets that you can use for 4 heroin; crush them up, mix them up, inject them. 5 And this was something that was regulated 14:03:38 6 by the U.S. Government. You had to have a license to 7 import it, to sell it, and you had to pay taxes on it. And so you can even find tax stamps for 8 9 opiates and that's the way it was. So if we put it up 14:03:54 10 here on a timeline, we've got the wild west until 1914 11 and then we've got the Harrison Act. 12 And that lasted up until 1970. But there 13 were some problems in 1970 that the nation needed to 14 confirm. We had a lot of people who served the military 14:04:15 15 and served valiantly in Vietnam, especially, and had been 16 exposed to opiate products, and they came back addicted. 17 And this led to a surge in illegal opium 18 availability through heroin and some other drugs. And 19 this was before Perdue invents their supposedly 14:04:38 20 nonaddictive opiates that we're talking about in this 21 case. 22 But what happened then is Richard Nixon 23 came along and he signed into law in 1970 the Controlled 24 Substances Act. Now, that's a very critical point of law

that His Honor will interpret and explain to you in the

14:04:57 25

right measures at the right time.

As he's already told you, everything I'm telling you right now is what I expect the evidence to be. Not a lick of evidence is coming out of my mouth. Couldn't give it to you if I tried. If I was to give evidence, I'd be disqualified as a lawyer because I can't do both.

So I'm not giving you evidence and I'm not giving you the law. Nobody's qualified to do that but His Honor. So I'm giving you my understanding of what I believe you will hear from him, but that's the best I can do at this point as part of my roadmap.

So when Richard Nixon, President Nixon, signs this, this Controlled Substances Act set out different levels of drugs. One they called Schedule 1 drugs. Now, these are drugs that really don't have a medicinal use. This is LSD, this is heroin. These are drugs that have a high potential for abuse but no medicinal use.

Then there are Schedule II drugs. These have a limited medical use but a high potential for abuse and addiction. And this includes Oxycodone, OxyContin, Percocet, Percodan, and since 2014, it includes Hydrocodone, Vicodin.

So level, Schedule III drugs are those that

13 14 14:05:47 15

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

14:05:12 5

14:05:25 10

17

16

1819

14:06:07 20

21

22

2324

14:06:35 25

1 have a limited medicinal use and potential for abuse and 2 dependence. This includes things like testosterone 3 supplements. This is where Hydrocodone was until 2014 4 when it got bumped up to Schedule II. There's Schedule IV, but it's not going to come up in this case, I don't 14:06:55 5 6 think, same with Schedule V. 7 Now, the law in the United States authorizes enforcement of this through the Drug 8 9 Enforcement Administration, which is part of the U.S. 14:07:14 10 Justice Department, DOJ, the Department of Justice. 11 And this is often abbreviated DEA, the Drug 12 Enforcement Administration. So the DEA has policing 13 authority in a sense. 14 And one of the witnesses that I'll be 14:07:33 15 calling probably, depending on timing, either one or two 16 witnesses after Dr. Lembke, is this gentleman right here, 17 his name is Joe Rannazzisi. Everybody, friend and foe alike, just calls him Joe Ran. So if you hear someone 18 19 say Joe Ran, you know they mean Joe Rannazzisi. 14:07:59 20 Now, Joe Rannazzisi used to be with the 21 DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration's Office of 22 Diversion Control. I'm going to talk about what 23 diversion was in a moment. But he was an agent for the 24 DEA and he became the Director of this.

He's not only -- he's no longer with the

14:08:17 25

1 DEA. He's not only someone who was formerly an agent and 2 a Director; he's also a pharmacist. The quy went to 3 pharmacy school. 4 He's not just a pharmacist; he's a lawyer. The guy went to law school. He's got more degrees than a 14:08:33 5 6 thermometer. 7 He is a whistleblower. And he's got hands-on experience. If his name didn't ring a bell with 8 9 you all, but you'll hear about how he's been written up 14:08:52 10 in news reports. You'll hear about him getting on "60" 11 Minutes," you'll hear about him testifying before 12 Congress, you'll hear about all of this. 13 He got his start in the regional office that governs also Ohio. It's all governed out of the 14 14:09:11 15 Detroit division of the DEA. And he's going to come, and 16 part of what he'll testify to, I expect, is that Nixon's 17 law, the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, it set up 18 what's called a closed system for opioids. 19 Let me explain what I mean. Under this, this is a really busy slide, I hate busy slides. 14:09:35 20 21 apologize right now. I apologize. This violates every 22 rule of slide-making that I know. But here it is. Let's 23 live with it, and I made it. I can't blame anybody else. 24 Everyone inside the circle must be 14:09:53 25 registered. What does that mean? It means you've got to

1	file registration papers with the DEA. You've got to
2	say, "I want to be registered. I want to do work in this
3	area. I want to, in a sense, make money off of these
4	drugs."
14:10:08 5	You can't make money off of them unless
6	you're registered.
7	And so this includes people who import the
8	serum, the opium serum, fee bank, whatever it may be, it
9	includes the people who import it into the country
14:10:27 10	because there are quotas of how much can be imported.
11	It includes the manufacturers. If you want
12	to make the drugs, you got to register.
13	It includes this group I'm calling the
14	middle people, but these are called distributors in the
14:10:46 15	DEA language. What that means is they buy from the
16	manufacturers, and they sell to the pharmacies.
17	So they're kind of the middle person.
18	They've got to be registered.
19	If a doctor's going to write the
14:11:01 20	prescription to take to the pharmacy, he's got to be
21	registered.
22	If a pharmacy chooses to sell these
23	dangerous drugs, they've got to be registered.
24	And the registration binds you to an
14:11:19 25	understanding of the law and following the law.

1 And it's extremely important. And it's important because of this word "Diversion" that I told 2 3 you I would talk to you about earlier. 4 Houston doesn't really have a football We've got the Texans, and they're about playing on 14:11:37 5 6 the high school level this year, but the Cleveland Browns 7 look pretty good. And the stadium's right over here. And I suspect if I'm trying to drive around the stadium 8 9 on game day, I might get diverted. 14:11:57 10 Diversion in an everyday language means not 11 being along the path that you were intending. 12 And it really means basically the same 13 thing in a case like this. So if you think about a road and if you stay on the road, you're using it properly, 14 14:12:18 15 that's the proper sales of the product, the proper 16 dispensing, the proper manufacturing, the proper 17 everything. If you follow the law, that's proper. 18 But anytime you see that word "Diversion," 19 that means that something unlawful has happened. 14:12:36 20 Somebody is doing something they should not be doing with 21 that drug. 22 And so when I told you that this circle of 23 legal sales is a closed circle, everyone has to be 24 registered. The people who sell outside of the circle or 14:12:54 25 who don't keep -- don't follow the law properly, and they go outside, that is not only unlawful, but it's also called diversion.

Now, it makes common sense that when you've got a product that people are addicted to, and people need it and their bodies crave it and they're willing to do outrageous things to meet the fix, it's not surprising that there's room for people to profit from those folks, sell it when maybe they shouldn't, turn a blind eye to what they ought to be focusing on.

But the law says that the registrants, the people within that circle, have a responsibility. They have a responsibility to prevent diversion, to stop that from happening, to break it apart, and they do that by following the rules. The rules are written so that diversion will not happen.

So, for example, I told you about the middle people, the distributors. Those distributors, they are supposed to be monitoring how many pills they are shipping to certain stores and how often they ship them.

They're supposed to be monitoring for suspicious orders, which might mean an order of an unusual size. I need, you know, an extra case of Oxy 30s. It might mean a suspicious or unusual pattern where every Tuesday, all of a sudden, they need the new drugs.

14:13:48 10

14:13:16 5

14:14:08 15

14:14:26 20

14:14:47 25

1 It might be a frequency. They used to get 2 them once a month, now they're getting them every third 3 day. 4 There's more, but the distributors, the middle people, taking from the manufacturers, giving it 14:15:05 5 6 to the pharmacies, those middle folks are supposed to be 7 monitoring for this. By the way, for certain periods of time, 8 9 these defendants in this case were distributors to themselves as well as pharmacies. That's one reason I go 14:15:20 10 11 into this explanation. 12 Now, Joe Rannazzisi, who is going to be 13 here to testify, is going to be able to talk to you about 14 the way he pursued folks and informed folks about these 14:15:41 15 responsibilities so I used for an example here a copy of 16 the letter that was sent to Walgreen's in 2007. And in 17 it, Joe Ran makes it clear that the law, the Controlled 18 Substances Act, requires that a distributor, that middle 19 person, design and operate a system to disclose to the 14:16:08 20 registrant suspicious orders. 21 They've got to design a system and they 22 have to operate it. This is going to become relevant in 23 a little bit. 24 He also told them the regulation also

requires that the registrant inform their local DEA

14:16:23 25

Division Office if there is a suspicious order.

14:17:54 25

14:17:37 20

14:17:22 15

14:16:49 5

14:17:05 10

Then he goes on to say that they need to do an independent analysis of that suspicious order before they sell it. Doesn't do any good to check it out after you throw the pills out on the street or to the pharmacies. But this is what the regulation says.

The last thing I'll put out at this point in time, the regulation specifically states suspicious orders include orders of an unusual size, orders deviating substantially from a normal pattern, orders of an unusual frequency. These, it doesn't take all of them, they're disjunctive, could be one, could be the other, doesn't even have to be those, there could be more. But that's what the distributors must do; they must develop and operate a system to report suspicious orders, those being orders of an unusual size, frequency, and pattern.

And they need to decline to ship until a determination that there is no diversion.

Now, you'll notice I left number two out.

It's coming. I just didn't order them well when I got my

PowerPoint ready to give you.

So put number two up there in your brain.

"Identifying suspicious orders." You've got to develop a
system to identify these orders, to report these orders,

and then decline to ship until the determination is made 1 2 that there's no diversion because that's the point of the 3 closed loop. 4 You want to make sure that the people 14:18:08 5 bringing prescriptions aren't bringing fake ones. You 6 want to make sure that you're not supplying pharmacies 7 with way too many pills than they should reasonably need. Now, let me talk to you about the 8 9 pharmacies. 14:18:26 10 Those middle people are called 11 distributors. Pharmacies are called dispensers. Thev 12 dispense the medicine. So dispensers are known as, not surprising 13 14 when you look at this picture, the last line of defense 14:18:46 15 to prevent diversion because these are the people who are 16 putting the pills onto the streets. 17 And so the dispenser has obligations as 18 well. The dispenser's obligations include providing 19 effective controls and procedures to quard against 14:19:09 20 diversion. In other words, they've got to be effective 21 at keeping the drugs from going where the drugs shouldn't 22 be going. 23 Don't let someone come in with three 24 different prescriptions from three different doctors for the same medicine. Don't let someone come in if he's a 14:19:24 25

1 fellow and he's got a prescription for pain medicine from 2 a gynecologist. Don't let prescriptions come in from 3 someone whose DEA license has been revoked. 4 Be on your quard. Be attentive. Provide effective controls. 14:19:52 5 I think the evidence is going to show that 6 7 they also have to exercise, and this is the legal word, "corresponding responsibility." Think about that for a 8 moment. It's corresponding responsibility to a doctor. 14:20:08 10 So you're a doctor, you're not supposed to write these 11 prescriptions unless it's legit, but then the pharmacist 12 is not supposed to do fill them unless it's legit. 13 Pharmacists go to years and years of school 14 to become a doctor of pharmacy. They study more drug interaction than doctors do in medical school. Doctors 14:20:32 15 16 go to medical school. They're learning how to deliver 17 babies, how to hack off a limb, how to figure out if 18 someone has cancer. They've got the whole broad 19 spectrum. 14:20:44 20 Pharmacists, they're zeroed in on drugs. 21 And they have to exercise a corresponding responsibility 22 to the doctors. That, by the way, makes a lot of sense 23 because there are some things doctors don't see. 24 If -- I won't use you, Ms. Fleming, but if

Ms. -- or I'm using you. If Ms. Fleming comes into one

14:21:03 25

1 doctor, she can explain her condition but if Ms. Fleming 2 then goes to a second doctor, he doesn't know she may not 3 have already gone to a first. 4 If she goes to a third doctor, they don't She could walk out with three prescriptions for 14:21:19 5 know. 6 the same malady. But the pharmacist ought to know who's 7 filling those prescriptions. So we'll talk about that some more in a 8 9 minute when we get to the episodes, but the pharmacist, 14:21:34 10 the last thing I put up here, the dispensers, they need 11 to provide suitable tools to pharmacists. 12 For example, you're going to hear about red 13 flags and how important it is to educate the pharmacists 14 about red flags. Red flags is something that says, "Whoa, trouble here. Warning, warning." 14:21:51 15 16 And so the pharmacists need the tools for 17 that. You'll hear about that. 18 Okay. Now, you've heard about the show. 19 Let's watch it. 14:22:07 20 So let me tell you about it. Let me tell 21 you what the evidence is going to show, and what I've 22 tried to do is I think put it into nine episodes is what 23 I wound up with and here's your binge watching. And His 24 Honor has told me I'm taking a break at 3:00 o'clock so

I'm good for about 35, 36 more minutes so if you'll bear

14:22:25 25

with me, please. And you all are being so patient.
Thank you.

So here it is. The TV show is Opioid

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

14:23:48 25

14:23:29 20

14:23:13 15

14:22:38 5

14:22:52 10

Epidemic, and it's one that has been raging across this country. It's not simply in Ohio. It's not simply in your counties, ladies. It's raging across the country.

These are opioid sales in the green line, from 1999 to 2010.

Now, those, the years we're concerned about really are the years going back to 19 -- the late 90s into the 2000s. Up to 2010, '11, '12, '13, '14, you'll hear how the pharmacists -- pharmacies, the businesses, have been trying to get their acts together some, and you'll hear about that. But we're looking at where this all really started snowballing.

And so you've got the opioid deaths. Those are that red line, and they've just gone up as the prescribing has. And so has opioid treatment, which is the blue line.

So this is the opioid epidemic. Episode number one is going to be meet the characters. So this is who we've got in this case. We've got the national pharmacy, CVS. And CVS owns thousands and thousands of pharmacies all around the United States. They've got legal departments, they've got regulation departments,

they've got marketing departments, they've got relationships with manufacturers, distributors.

14:25:27 25

14:25:06 20

14:24:50 15

14:24:05 5

14:24:29 10

And you'll hear all about them during the trial. The first witness I'm calling works for CVS.

Now, another party here is, aside from CVS, we've got Walgreen's. Walgreen's is right here on this table behind me. And they, of course, are a big national pharmacy in the United States we're looking at. We're not looking at boots or the foreign issues but we're looking here in the United States at their Walgreen stores.

By the way, I shop at Walgreen's and I shop at CVS. Not a ton, but I do. And I'm not holding pharmacists, I'm not pointing my finger at the pharmacists in this case. I'm pointing my finger at the business.

So we've got a real nice pharmacist from Giant Eagle, for example, and she just seems to be so nice and polite as she stood up and greeted us all. I'm not accusing her or any individual pharmacist per se of causing this problem. I'm after the businesses, I'm after the big business that's behind it that empowers or fails to empower their pharmacists; that trains or fails to train or wrongly trains their pharmacists, that adopt the policies that follow the law or don't follow the law.

And that's what you're going to hear about.

Walmart, of course Walmart is well-known worldwide, a big company. You'll hear about Walmart in this case. There are some Walmart stores. Those are the three national retailers, as the Judge said. Then there's Giant Eagle, which is the local one. And I'm from Texas. I don't -- I don't buy groceries here really but I'm sure it's probably a great place to go and buy a jar of peanut butter or something.

I'm not looking at their groceries. I'm not looking at how nice they are. They've been around for four generations. I'm not looking at that. I'm just looking at when they were choosing to make money by selling these registered drugs, did they do it right or not.

So you'll hear from them, I'm sure, that they're a wonderful grocery store, that invites you to come in and they'll smile and greet you and they'll bring a nice pharmacist and they're wonderful people. I'm not fussing any of that.

I want to know, in the home office, how are they conducting their business and did they contribute in a significant way to the nuisance that's there, the legal nuisance.

So all of that will be measured against

14:25:57 10

14:25:41 5

14:26:16 15

14:26:31 20

14:26:43 25

this idea they are part of that closed system, and I told you they're actually distributors and dispensers. So dispensers, CVS, you could go get your prescription filled for Oxycodone. You could go to Walgreen's and get it filled, Walmart and get it filled, Giant Eagle and get it filled. That's — they were making money selling the drugs.

And there are times where people need the drugs and ought to be able to get them. I'm not fussing that.

distributors. In fact, McKesson, Cardinal Health, and AmerisourceBergen are called the big three. And McKesson had a good bit of it -- or, no, AmerisourceBergen had a good bit of it owned for a while at least by Walgreen's, not really getting into that kind of mess, but the big three are well-known distributors. But there came a time where these pharmacies that we've got in here decided that instead of fully relying on others, they themselves would take some of the role of distributor.

And so Walmart, CVS, Walgreen's, Giant

Eagle, for a period of time, they're distributing as well
as dispensing so they had the legal obligations of both.

And I'll explain that to you. Remember, the distributors
have to develop a system to identify suspicious orders,

14:27:14 10

14:27:32 15

14:27:51 20

14:28:08 25

report the suspicious orders, and then decline to ship until they are determining through due diligence that there's no diversion.

And then the dispensers, what do they do, they're that last line of defense, have to have effective controls and procedures, exercise corresponding responsibility, and the businesses need to provide the tools. And that's what we've got.

Now, the last two meet the characters, the last two characters you need to know about are Lake County. I tried to figure out Lake County. I think one or two of you may live in Lake County. I did not know, until this case, President Garfield used to live in Lake County. But evidently stand on his porch and give speeches.

You'll hear about Trumbull County. I tried to find what President came from Trumbull County. I can't find one. But the front man for the food fighters came from Trumbull County so I threw him on there. But you're going to hear from them. Ms. Fraser will take the stand and she's the Lake County ADAM's Board Executive Director. She's the state board member for the Mental Health and Advocacy Coalition and she'll talk to you about Lake County and the effects it's had on Lake County.

14:28:25 5

14:28:57 15

14:29:16 20

14:29:36 25

1 The effects are tremendous. It's not only 2 costing the lives of people but it affects children who 3 are born to addicted moms. It affects the court system. 4 It affects the county budget in a lot of different ways 14:29:54 5 that you'll hear about from not only Ms. Fraser but I'll 6 probably call at least one or two other county witnesses 7 if time allows it. You'll hear from the Trumbull County Mental 8 9 Health and Recovery Board Executive Director, 14:30:08 10 Ms. Caraway. You should have two Rs in your name, April, and I apologize about that. It's only one R? I'm glad I 11 12 got that right. 13 (Laughter.) 14 MR. LANIER: Anyway, that was a great 14:30:20 15 error. 16 She's the Executive Director. She's also a 17 member of the Trumbull County Opiate Death Review 18 Committee. She'll tell you about that. She'll tell you 19 about being a founding member for the Alliance For 14:30:33 20 Substance Abuse Prevention. 21 I do expect to call also the commander from 22 the Sheriff's Office, Toni Villanueva. Captain 23 Villanueva is not only a commander but he headed up the 2.4 multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional law enforcement task 14:30:52 25 force.

14:32:12 25

14:31:56 20

14:31:38 15

14:31:09 5

14:31:24 10

Time permitting and His Honor allowing, I will also be calling Nicole McCallion. Nicole is a foster parent, an Lake County resident who herself is a foster parent and then trains other foster parents who are having to take in some of these opiate babies. And she'll talk about the effects of the opiate epidemic on children. So those are the characters.

So let's get to the next episode because we are after all binge watching. Next episode is Failing At the Job.

See, now, remember, and I'm going to do this rapidly but you've got to keep this in your brain, the distributors have to develop and operate a system to identify suspicious orders and report those before they dispense, before they ship. The dispensers, remember, last line of defense, and they have to provide effective controls and procedures to guard against diversion, exercise corresponding responsibility to the doctors and provide suitable tools. And this becomes important because one of the witnesses you'll hear within the first two weeks is Dr. Carmen Catizone. He's a pharmacist; a doctor at that time.

He's the former head of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. It's a big national group that's really tried to get the pharmacies in line

on this stuff. He's going to testify about how companies failed to regard red flags. Red flags is a language used by the DEA, used by industry, it's used by lots of folks. A red flag means, "Stop. Don't dispense until you figure out if it's correct."

And so he's going to talk about how companies failed, how these companies failed regarding red flags and the system to detect them and what to do when you encounter them.

And that's what he's going to be talking about.

He's going to say that defendants should have had in place from the very beginning, not after they get sued, not after they get written up, but from the very beginning, they're supposed to have red flag policies and they didn't.

From the very beginning, they should have trained their pharmacists on red flags and they didn't. From the very beginning, they should have given the pharmacists the tools they need, and they didn't.

And we've done an analysis of these red flags, and some of the red flags you're going to hear about, let me put them up here for you. One of the ones is doctor-shopping. If you determined, if you have a computer that will tell you if someone's been filling a

14:32:55 10

14:32:38 5

14:33:11 15

14:33:25 20

14:33:48 25

prescription for the same thing somewhere else from a different doctor, you don't fill it. But you've got to have the system to check.

CVS has to be willing to enter the data into the system, and have their computers drawn up in such a way that they're able to detect if someone's doctor shopping.

That's the responsibility of the company, of the business. It's giving the tools to the pharmacists.

If someone is getting more drugs than the days they're supposed to be taking it, that should tell you something. That's a red flag.

In other words, if I'm getting drugs for 120 days that I'm supposed to be taking it for a hundred days, there's a red flag that should go up. Now, the red flag doesn't mean you're not allowed to fill it. A red flag means, "Time out. I need to talk to you about this. Can you tell me why you're getting this? Can you tell me who the doctor is?" If you've got two doctors writing the same prescription, it's calling up the doctor saying, "Did you know doctor so and so wrote the same prescription just an hour earlier? Did you do that on purpose or is that something you just didn't know and we're seeing as a pharmacy?" Or, "He got this

14:35:17 25

1 prescription filled three days ago and now he has another 2 Is that on purpose? Did he lose the first drugs?" 3 The prescribing patterns. 99 percent of 4 doctors, I think, are marvelous doctors on this issue. The problem is the one percenters. The one percenters 5 14:35:35 who will write a prescription for just about anybody who 6 7 wants one. They're call pill mill doctors. And when the DEA finds them, they'll work to revoke their 8 9 registration. 14:35:55 10 Some of them wind up doing prison time for 11 it. And by the way, when I said there are lots of folks 12 at fault here, these doctors they are in that line. They 13 are a significant part of the problem. 14 But how's the pharmacy going to know 14:36:11 15 whether or not to fill that prescription, do the 16 corresponding responsibility? They've got to have a 17 system to help them identify bad prescribing patterns. 18 You're going to hear about drug cocktails. 19 You shouldn't -- evidently it is a huge red flag if you 14:36:31 20 take an opiate and a Benzodiazepine, a Benzo drug. If 21 you take those two together, it's like, (gesture) and 22 that should be a red flag to a pharmacist. 23 Those doctors shouldn't be writing those

two drugs to go together, and that's been known, I think

the first articles on that came out in 2007. Certainly

24

14:36:51 25

1 by 2010. Of course the pharmacies need to have a system 2 so they can see if this person filled a Benzo 3 prescription the day or week before. 4 Another red flag, cash. If you come in and you're buying an expensive prescription and you're paying 14:37:11 5 6 cash, you don't have insurance, doesn't mean it's not 7 legit. It may very well be. But it's a red flag and the pharmacist should stop and ask you questions and 8 determine it's not diversion. That's their job. So this 9 14:37:33 10 is episode two, Failing At the Job. 11 Let me give you some of the reasons why I 12 say this is Failing At the Job. I will grab some of 13 these documents here and show you exactly what I'm 14 talking about. 14:37:57 15 So one of the documents I've got is 16 labeled -- Your Honor, for the record it's Plaintiffs' 17 Exhibit 28124, and this is the Controlled Substances Act 18 itself, and you're going to hear about the Controlled 19 Substances Act, that the whole reason it was written is 14:38:13 20 because of a concern in part on diversion. 21 I won't take the time to put that one up 22 yet, but you'll hear about it and when you do, I want you 23 to remember.

Now, these companies are going to stand up here and give an opening statement, and they're going to

24

14:38:26 25

say they did nothing wrong. They're going to say, "We 1 2 are not any part of the problem." They're going to blame 3 everybody else but themselves. 4 But I'm going to bring you evidence that they were part of the problem. 14:38:41 5 And so, for example, I'm going to bring you 6 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 8804. Mr. Wilson, can you give me, 8 please, the IP? Thank you. 9 8804, and this is a document that -- let's 14:39:00 10 see if I can get it where you can see it -- this is an 11 order to show cause that was put out by the U.S. 12 Department of Justice Drug Enforcement Administration. 13 Oops, there we go. U.S. Department of Justice Drug Enforcement 14 Administration, and it's an order to show cause. "Notice 14:39:18 15 16 is hereby given to inform Walgreen Corporation of the 17 immediate suspension of," their registration because the 18 registration, "Constitutes an imminent danger to the 19 public health and safety." 14:39:37 20 This is concerning a Walgreen's that was in 21 Arlington or they're asking them but it's a Walgreen's 22 that was in Florida. Walgreen's Jupiter, Florida 23 Distribution Center is the one that it's concerned about. 24 And what they said is that this center did 14:39:56 25 not have -- it's interesting, look at number four.

1 "Since 2009, Walgreen's' Jupiter, Florida Distribution 2 Center has been the single largest distributor of 3 Oxycodone products in Florida." 4 You can go up before that. "Since at least 2009, the state of Florida 14:40:16 5 6 has been the epicenter of a notorious well-documented 7 epidemic of prescription drug abuse." You're going to hear testimony about how 8 there was a drug cartel in Ohio going down to Florida to 9 14:40:32 10 get their drugs and bring them back up here to sell. 11 And Walgreen's is doing this, and 12 Walgreen's is doing it without a proper program in place. 13 The DEA continues to say, Paragraph 7, "Walgreen's failed 14 to detect and report suspicious orders by its pharmacy 14:40:58 15 customers," and quotes that language. I've now quoted it 16 so much, you'll be able to quote it soon, "Distributors 17 are required to design and operate a system to disclose 18 to the registrant suspicious orders of controlled 19 substances, orders of unusual size, deviating from a 14:41:16 20 normal pattern, and orders of unusual frequency." 21 And not only did Walgreen's fail to detect

And not only did Walgreen's fail to detect and report this but Walgreen's knew or should have known about their obligation to do it. It's been spelled out in detail in three letters from the DEA's deputy assistant administrator.

22

23

24

14:41:37 25

1 So I'm going to be giving you evidence that 2 they failed to do this. 3 I'm going to be giving you evidence that 4 they -- I'll give you another one. It's Plaintiffs' 14:41:51 5 Exhibit 57. This is not the DEA talking. This is 6 Walgreen's doing their own internal report. And in 2008, in their internal report, the 7 compliance for the Perrysburg Distribution Center, that's 8 the one that supplied their Ohio stores, the compliance 14:42:11 10 report says the following: 11 Internal investigation by Walgreen's 12 says -- if I can make this a little bigger -- "Walgreen's 13 is required to have a process to disclose to the DEA any 14 suspicious orders of controlled drugs that deviate from 14:42:31 15 the normal size, pattern and frequency." 16 Look at the risk here. "Walgreen's is not, 17 not verifying the legitimacy of suspicious orders which 18 could lead to the fulfillment of an illicit order." 19 The company knew from its own internal 14:42:53 20 audits it wasn't doing it. The DEA would send out 21 letters saying this. It's up to CVS. We've got the CVS 22 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 10064, CVS says, letter from between 23 the Department of Justice, CVS Indiana, "Investigators 24 from the DEA Indianapolis District Office," that's one

that services this region as well, "initiated a

14:43:20 25

regulatory investigation at CVS Indiana. As a result the following violation was identified." They failed to design and maintain a system to detect suspicious and report suspicious orders.

This is, this is what these companies have failed to do. And it's because of this failure that we've got a number of different understandings.

Now, please understand, we're not able to verify every store, every Distribution Center. That's not the way the DEA works. It's kind of like a police officer catching folks for speeding; you don't catch everyone speeding. They catch the ones that are speeding when you're there.

But if you find that, you're going to find that the companies were ignoring the red flags they should have followed. CVS is subject to a situation in Florida. Again, Florida was where all this stuff was feeding the east coast certainly, and there's a decision that was handed out. It's going to be hard to read because the print is so small, that if I put it on the screen, you still can't read it so I'm just going to have to tell you that you'll hear about this because it's the Holiday case is the name of it, from Holiday, Florida, and in this, an Administrative Law Judge found credible a professor's testimony that controlled substances are

14:43:36 5

14:44:03 10

14:44:17 15

14:44:38 20

14:45:05 25

high-alert drugs, that drugs such as opioids and Benzos and other depressant drugs require the highest level of scrutiny, that in pharmacy practice, there are various red flags which cause a high level of concern that might cause a pharmacist not to fill a prescription or to take other kinds of actions, and they'll talk about all of that but ultimately, the DEA was going to shut down these CVS stores.

You'll hear tales about how they were having to be real careful because they'd get their shipment in on a Tuesday, and they wouldn't have enough drugs to last until the next shipment came in, that people had figured out the drugs came in on a Tuesday, and that's when they'd line up to take the drugs.

You'll hear that these Florida things are no lark. This is a PowerPoint that was put together by Joe Ran, and he actually presented this PowerPoint. See if I can get the whole thing on the screen.

He presented this PowerPoint in 2015 when Joe Ran was the Deputy Assistant Administrator, the Office of Diversion Control for the Drug Enforcement Administration, and here's what he called it in this: The Florida Migration.

He said, "The vast majority of patients visiting Florida's pain clinics come from out of state.

14:45:37 10

14:45:23 5

14:45:55 15

14:46:10 20

14:46:27 25

Out of state, including places like Ohio."

14:48:10 25

14:47:49 20

14:47:29 15

14:46:52 5

14:47:10 10

He goes on to put a map out of the migration of pain clinics and talked about the pills from Florida into Georgia, into Tennessee, Kentucky, into Ohio as they made their way over to Missouri.

You're not only going to get this from Joe Ran and his presentation, but this was known by the pharmacy companies. They knew this stuff was going on.

CVS has a document that's Plaintiffs' Exhibit 11918, and in that document, it's a PowerPoint presentation but they put that migration out of Florida slide that they got from McKesson that shows the same migration pattern.

And this is back in 2014.

So they knew this was going on. And they didn't only know it this way, you can go all the way back to 2009. I want to show you a Walmart document that you'll hear about at trial. It's Plaintiffs' 26699 and it's a 2005 document that's got a whole section on Florida.

And this whole section on Florida, with the pills spelling the word "Help" out to the side, talked about how the top 35 dispensing practitioners of OxyContin nationwide were located in Florida; 25 within Broward County, that according to the DEA ARCOS records

1 the Florida physicians dispense five times more Oxycodone 2 than the national average. Florida has increasingly 3 become a source state for illegally diverted medications 4 for residents in Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, 14:48:31 5 Massachusetts, New York and other states. Again, Ohio. 6 That's the way it was working, and they 7 knew that to be the case. So you'll hear this testimony. You'll see 8 9 these documents. They'll provide you with a good 14:48:48 10 understanding of why the Government has dealt with each 11 of these in some ways rather severely. 12 You will hear about settlement agreements 13 these defendants entered into with the Government. 14 You'll hear about Plaintiffs' Exhibit 8954, which is a 14:49:12 15 settlement agreement that was entered into between CVS 16 and the Government. 17 You'll hear that the policies that were 18 allowing this to happen in Florida not only affected Ohio 19 because of the Florida migration, but these were national 14:49:29 20 policies. This is the way they were doing business all 21 over the U.S. 22 Florida is where they got stung, but they 23 were doing this everywhere. So you'll read about how CVS, in this actual document, acknowledges that they do 24 14:49:47 25 have a corresponding responsibility to dispense only

prescriptions issued for a legitimate medical purpose.

They knew they had that responsibility and they also admitted there, although not here, to failing. They admitted in Subparagraph K, they acknowledged that certain CVS Pharmacy retailers did dispense controlled substances in a manner not fully consistent with their compliance obligations under that law, the CSA.

And I'd love to say that that only happened once, but such is not the case.

And I don't know what all we'll get into with you but I hope to also get into Plaintiffs' Exhibit 8955, this is another settlement, where CVS entered into another agreement to settle with the United States Government. And this one for Rhode Island. And in this one, they acknowledged again that their CVS pharmacy retail stores in Maryland did dispense certain controlled substances in a manner not fully consistent with their compliance obligations by not conducting corresponding responsibility between 2008 and 2012 when dispensing certain controlled substances in some instances.

So you're going to get to hear about these things. You're going to get to hear the excuses. But I don't think you're going to find that the lawyers will ever accept responsibility.

And that's the problem we've got. So where

14:50:27 10

14:50:09 5

14:50:48 15

14:51:10 20

14:51:28 25

14:52:55 25

14:52:37 20

14:52:25 15

14:51:49 5

14:52:11 10

does that leave us? You know, I can do more. I've just pulled those out. Walgreen's, they've got the same problem, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 15 is a settlement between Walgreen's where Walgreen's admitted, if you go to Paragraph 6, at the end of the stipulation, thank you, the stipulation and agreement, Walgreen's acknowledges suspicious order reporting for distribution to certain pharmacies did not meet the standards identified by the DEA in three letters from the DEA's Deputy Assistant Administrator that were sent to every registered manufacturer and distributor, including Walgreen's in 2006, '7 and '7.

Furthermore Walgreen's acknowledges that certain Walgreen's retail pharmacies did on some occasions dispense certain controlled substances in a manner not fully consistent with its compliance obligations.

And you're going to hear about this from each of these folks and we'll put on the evidence and I think it's going to be pretty compelling that if we go back to the computer, Juan, thank you, that they failed at the job. That's not to say they didn't do something; they did something but it was too little too late.

I don't know how many of you garden. We do some gardening in Texas, and we have some weeds that are

really pernicious, they're really, really bad, and if you get them in your garden, you don't notice it immediately but once they take over, I mean it's like you get -- we call it nut grass. I'm sure it's got some fancy name. You get nut grass in your garden, you're like gone for because it spreads by these nuts down under the ground with these real thin little tendrils that grow from one nut to another and you can pull all day long, if you don't get the nut, it just comes back up stronger and just spreads out more. It's really, really bad.

If you've got a nut-grass-ridden garden or you've got an overgrown garden, the odds are it didn't happen yesterday.

These are problems that have been long growing. The problems folks face today is not something that happened because of bad policies yesterday. The bad policies go back into the 2000s; 1999 to 2010, '11, '12, '13, '14. And the problem with this is you get a lot of people addicted to some of these opiates that are prescription opiates, and then all of a sudden, you cut off the prescriptions, and that availability is not on the street, and they've got an opiate addiction. So at that point in time, they've got to seek out the illegal opiates.

And you're actually seeing a rise in heroin

14:54:26 25

and Fentanyl deaths now from street Fentanyl and heroin because now the supply of the overabundance of prescription opiates is being cut back. This is what is a classic snowball effect.

It's that cartoon, I looked for it, I couldn't find it, but I remember it as a kid, I don't think I was dreaming it, but it was a snowball at the top of a hill that starts rolling down and as it rolls down it picks up skiers and you can see their skis, you know, sticking out of the snowball as the snowball gets bigger and bigger and then down at the end, it hits the village at the end.

This problem started a long time ago and it's snowballed. It's grown. And I'll tell you in some ways, COVID made it worse because people are stuck at home and addiction issues got worse for a lot of people during the COVID problem.

I think a lot of what happened here is well-explained through screens. So I'm going to, if the Court would allow me to show you this, I brought some screens here. If that breaks, we're in really bad trouble. Can you carefully — thank you, sweetie.

Your Honor, I've got a towel here because I don't want to mess up your courtroom.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

14:54:57 **10** 11

1213

14:55:12 15

16

17

18

19

14:55:38 20

21

22

23

24

14:55:55 25

MR. LANIER: Thank you.

14:57:43 25

14:57:22 20

14:56:57 15

14:56:11 5

14:56:30 10

So these are screens. You can use them for cooking, but they're kind of big to use them for cooking. You can use them for gardening to screen different things out and soil. Heavens, maybe you can use them for gold. I don't know. But they come with different sized holes in them. And the tighter the screen, the more careful the screening process and you'll let less things through that shouldn't get through.

You can get screens with really big holes, you know? And so I was -- I was playing around with this trying to figure out a good way to illustrate what the pharmacies need to do with screens, and I thought one way I could do that would be to take, take this screen, and I took some flour -- thank you, Rachel -- I took some flour and I buried within it red candy, Red Hots and -- oh, I got Red Hots in there -- I got some red Nerds, I just went red, but if I wanted the flour, I got to screen out the red, like a pharmacy is supposed to screen out through red flags, bad prescriptions.

It doesn't mean everyone that's red is bad but the pharmacies are supposed to.

So if you took this, if I'm using screens that have way too big of holes, I can pour it in but you're going to find that a lot of the Red Hots make it

1 through. And almost all the Nerds. A couple Red Hots 2 got stuck, but not many. 3 So you can see that this screen was totally 4 ineffective because it didn't screen out the bad stuff. 14:58:00 5 And this is the way the pharmacies started. 6 Their screens, were totally ineffective. They let everything through. They didn't -- they just pretended 7 that they're a vending machine where if someone showed a 8 9 prescription and stuck in the money, they dispensed the 14:58:23 10 medicine, when the law says they're not supposed to be 11 that way. The law says they're supposed to be a tight 12 screen. So what did they do? They got in trouble. 13 CVS got in trouble. They tightened the screen up a 14 little bit. You'll hear about some of them being under a 14:58:36 15 16 watchful eye by the DEA for a period of time where the 17 DEA was really focused on them and they cleaned up their 18 act for a while, and it will help them a lot in here they 19 think because they will show you, look, here was our 14:58:51 20 great policy. Well, yeah, that's when someone's looking. 21 They tightened the holes a little bit and 22 it will catch some, but there's -- even though you catch 23 some, there's still a lot that you miss. 24 And so you'll hear about those policies.

Ultimately what you're going to find out is

14:59:08 25

15:00:38 25

15:00:22 20

15:00:04 15

14:59:27 5

14:59:51 10

that the law says the screen is supposed to be plenty tight. That means that it's not always going to catch everything, and that means it's going to take some time with each prescription. Yes, we recognize time is money, but if you've got a good screen that you can sit there and take the time, you can sift through and let the good prescriptions through and keep the bad prescriptions out.

And that's what the law said they're supposed to do. The problem is time-wise they don't want you to spend -- okay, I saw that. Yeah, okay, it's a skeleton in a chair. I didn't make this up. This is actually one of their documents. This is a Walgreen's document.

Because they figured out quickly that they want to fill your prescription fast enough that you don't leave the store and come back to get it because if you leave the store and come back to get it, you don't shop. But if they can fill it within 10, 15 minutes, you'll spend that time shopping and you'll buy more stuff because you'll just wait for it.

So they didn't have enough pharmacists hired to be able to do the screening process that takes some time, and I'll talk more about that after the break, Your Honor, but you asked me to stop at 3:00 and I think I --

1 THE COURT: Good time to stop? 2 All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll 3 take our mid-afternoon break, 15 minutes, and then we'll 4 pick up with the balance of plaintiffs' opening. 15:00:50 5 (Recess taken.) 6 THE COURT: Okay. Please be seated. 7 And, Mr. Lanier, you may continue. 8 MR. LANIER: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 May it please the Court. 15:20:50 10 So, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you got a 11 good stretch in, got some caffeine. I'm raring to go 12 through the mid afternoon. 13 You know, there are aspects of this world 14 that you really don't know, I didn't know I should say, 15:21:14 15 until I got into this case. And a prime example is the 16 evidence that you're going to hear about the way they 17 figure out how long they want you to wait. 18 They don't want you to wait too long. 19 You'll either go take the business somewhere else and 15:21:36 20 you'll leave and get your prescription later so they 21 don't want to give it to you immediately because they 22 want you to have time to shop, and they've figured out 23 the pharmacy is always going to be at the back of the 2.4 store by and large because that way, you walk through 15:21:50 25 everything to get to it when you go there.

1 And that's okay. I mean, business exists 2 to do well, and I'm not fussing that, but it's 3 fascinating to see these metrics. And so the PowerPoint 4 that I drew that from is a Walgreen's PowerPoint in 2016. And, Ms. Fleming, it is 17253. 15:22:14 5 And it's one that just really talks about 6 7 the problems. Now, you might say, well, the easy solution to this, if you need the time to check out the 8 prescriptions to make sure they're good, and you don't 15:22:34 10 have the time because it's going to take too long, add 11 another pharmacist. Add a pharmacy tech. Technician. 12 But they don't add those if they can avoid it, because it 13 costs too much, and it's all a question of how much money 14 do they make versus how much it would cost. And so 15:23:01 15 that's what they -- that's the position, that's where 16 they get stuck. 17 So when you look at what they've done, what 18 they've done for some periods of time, it's a black hole. 19 They don't have anything really in place. They're 15:23:20 20 filling prescriptions pell-mell. I mean it's just 21 there's a void that's out there. 22 Where it comes to policies, the idea of a 23 suspicious order monitoring to design and operate a 24 system, they don't -- not gee, they sold this for a few

weeks without doing that or gee, they sold this for a few

15:23:42 25

15:25:26 25

15:25:05 20

15:24:42 15

15:24:03 5

15:24:24 10

months without doing that or gee, they sold this for half a year. No, they went years without a program, even though the law requires it.

You're going to hear about how they ignored

You're going to hear about how they ignored red flags like crazy. Some of their witnesses even said, "I don't know what a red flag is." And I think we'll be able to bring that testimony to you.

I'll be real interested to hear from

Mr. Davis, the first witness. He didn't know if there's
an epidemic or not. I hope by the time he's gotten here,
since I deposed him, he's learned there is an epidemic.

But he wouldn't even admit to that.

So you're going to hear all of this kind of stuff, and this is the part of the case where I'm going to hopefully be showing you that what the company did was too little too late. It's like the screens, they should have had the right screen from the very beginning, but they only made the screen smaller and smaller when they were forced and forced and forced.

I'll tell you, this was news to us. When we filed this case on behalf of these counties, first time around we didn't even sue the pharmacies. We didn't get the documents. We didn't get the numbers. We didn't see what all they had done. We didn't have all of the migratory patterns from Florida.

1 And so once we learned those things, we 2 bring them into the case and they're hear because they 3 won't accept any responsibility. 4 And so that's what we're going to be asking 15:25:45 5 of you is to determine whether or not they have significant responsibility in causing this epidemic in 6 7 these counties. They'll say not. We think they are part of 8 9 the problem. 15:26:03 10 So let me get to episode number four. 11 Episode four, Where Data Makes Money. 12 Now, let's be clear, business exists unless 13 it's a nonprofit business, business exists to make 14 That's good. That's the American system. 15:26:26 15 Great. I'm all for that. 16 I'm a lawyer. I own my law firm. We exist 17 to make a profit, but that doesn't mean we're not still 18 supposed to be socially responsible. 19 And the same is true with business. There are right ways to make a profit and there are ways that 15:26:48 20 21 aren't right to make a profit. 22 So here's one of the ways they make money. 23 These stores keep track of every prescription that's 2.4 bought, and while they would not give that information to 15:27:11 25 their pharmacists for a long time, what they did do is

1 they sold it. This is where data kind of gets lost under 2 the dollar bill, but D-A-T-A, this is where data makes 3 money. 4 Let me tell you what they would do. You go into a Walgreen's, CVS, and you go buy a prescription or 15:27:36 5 6 you may have one of those little cards where you do your 7 card. They keep track of everything you buy. That's why they'll spew you out those big receipts that have all 8 9 these coupons targeted to your buying. They know exactly 15:27:59 10 what you're buying. 11 They'll keep track of it for economics 12 because they will take your prescription data, what 13 prescription you had filled, how many pills, whether or 14 not there were refills, what the dosage was, what your 15:28:21 15 Zip Code is, they'll take the information on the doctor 16 that wrote the prescription, what her DEA registration 17 number is or him, doctors, I guess either gender, what 18 hers or his is. 19 They'll take and keep track of all of that 15:28:41 20 data to sell to another company. 21 It's a vicious circle. It is -- do you 22 have a piece of paper? I can use card stock. Thank you. 23 Your Honor, can I go to the Elmo, please? 24 Here's the way it went down and you all

will learn throughout this trial, assuming His Honor lets

15:29:04 25

15:30:57 25

15:30:30 20

15:30:14 15

15:29:23 5

15:29:39 10

me draw periodically, that I am a horrible artist. Okay? I cannot draw my way out of a paper sack. Don't pick me for Pictionary.

But here's the way it will go down. You've got the store, and the store, I'll put an Rx on because they're a pharmacy. Okay. Now, this store, people go into the store and they take their prescriptions and the store fills the prescription.

And then let me make that a little bit bigger, the store takes that information and the store sells the information to a company for a long time known as I.M.S, also known as Ocudea (sic), and that company pays money back for the data. So this drugstore, CVS, I mean makes somewhere north of \$5 million selling the data. They even negotiate the price later on where they are selling it per prescription. Wait until you hear how much more they got if they sold the data after filling a ninety-day opiate prescription versus a 30-day.

But we'll get into that evidence later.

I.M.S takes all of that data so the data is going to I.M.S, while the money is going back to the pharmacy.

And then I.M.S takes the data, and I.M.S sells the data to the drug manufacturers like Perdue

Pharma, who makes the opiates, or did for quite awhile.

1 And so the drug manufacturer is going to 2 give money to I.M.S while I.M.S gives the drug 3 manufacturer your data. 4 Then you know what the drug manufacturer 15:31:23 5 does? The drug manufacturer says, "Hmm, you know some of 6 these doctors are doing a good job filling prescriptions, some of them aren't. We need to send our sales force out 7 to these doctors so that our sales force will sell to the 8 doctors and convince the doctors to write more 15:31:51 10 prescriptions." 11 Write more prescriptions for the opiates. 12 So the doctors write more prescriptions. 13 And what does that mean? More patients going in to get 14 their prescriptions filled so the store winds up making 15:32:17 15 more money on the back end and that's the cycle. 16 And that's what the stores were doing. 17 Now, the best I've been able to look, 18 Walmart was a little bit different. Walmart looks to me 19 like, as I'm reading the contracts, and you'll get these, 15:32:35 20 but it looks to me like Walmart was more interested in 21 getting some of the data themselves than getting the 22 money because ir wants to be able to figure out what 23 their competitors are doing. 24 And so you've got this vicious system

that's set up, and where data makes money, these pharmacy

15:32:53 25

1 companies are all over that data. They have got that. 2 In fact, let me just give you a feel for what one of these contracts look like. This is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 3 4 23326. And this is the master data agreement. That's This is the sale of data. 15:33:18 5 all this is. The master data agreement, this one dates 6 7 back to 1998, between CVS Pharmacy and I.M.S, the data 8 company. All right? I.M.S. 9 Now, here's what it says. It says, first 15:33:41 10 of all, CVS gets to keep all of the ownership rights in 11 the data. CVS owns their data that they're selling, but 12 they're allowing I.M.S to use it for "In development, 13 marketing, distribution of projection, marketing, sales, 14 and promotion analyses." 15:34:03 15 They know that they're taking the data and 16 it's going out there to be used in marketing and sales 17 efforts. CVS knew this. And CVS even says, in 18 19 provisions on Page 3, that "For each data month," as long as they give valid records where the rate is equal to or 15:34:22 20 21 exceeds 70 percent, then they get their guaranteed cash 22 payment. 23 In other words, they've got to get at least 24 70 percent of those prescriptions and that data out 15:34:35 25 there, and that's how they get their cash payment.

1 And then they also contract and pledge, CVS 2 does, that they'll use reasonable efforts and exercise 3 due diligence in collecting and transmitting complete and 4 accurate data. So they have a contractual obligation where 15:34:55 5 6 it makes them money to do an accurate due diligent job of 7 collecting the data, getting the data right and selling it because that's what they're doing at the back end. 8 9 And they do that, and I'm telling you, you 15:35:17 10 want to know what kind of data they can get? Let me show 11 you the data they get on Page 7 of this document. 12 They're collecting data on your 13 prescriptions, yours -- not yours, I'm not allowed to 14 talk about you as a juror -- they're collecting data on 15:35:39 15 prescriptions -- I apologize, Your Honor -- and they're 16 collecting data of a store number and that Zip Code so 17 they know where it's being bought and the prescription 18 number and what date it's being filled, and whether it 19 was new or refill, so the doctors, the salespeople can 15:35:57 20 figure out which doctors are refilling and which doctors 21 aren't, which doctors are starting new patients, which 22 doctors aren't. 23 It's got the dispensed number and the

product description. It's got all these other numbers,

the quantity dispensed, how many days' supply that is,

24

15:36:10 25

1 oh, the costs, whether or not the payment was by 2 insurance or cash, all of this data, what are red flags. 3 It's being collected, it's just being sold and not being 4 provided to their pharmacists to use so that their pharmacists can make reasonable decisions when they 15:36:31 5 6 exercise their corresponding responsibility. 7 And they get the doctor's last name, they understand how many refills are remaining, how many have 8 9 been authorized so that the doctors or the sales force 15:36:50 10 can ultimately go to the doctor and say "Hey, you've got 11 some prescriptions coming up. We've learned that you can 12 increase the dosage and it's going to help." 13 They get the doctor's DEA number, the 14 doctor's Zip Code, so they know if the doctor's writing 15:37:10 15 the prescription in Florida but it's being filled in 16 Ohio. 17 They get the patient's birth date, the 18 patient's sex, the patient's Zip Code. They get lots 19 more data than this. And you'll get these agreements and 15:37:32 20 you'll get to look at them and you'll hear me examine the 21 witnesses over them, and you'll see the millions and 22 millions of dollars that were made. Juan, if we go back 23 to the PowerPoint. Thank you. 24 You'll see the millions of dollars that

were made where it's profitable to collect data. Even in

15:37:45 25

1 their annual report, CVS's annual report talks about how 2 important data is. Let me see if I can blow this section 3 up a little bit. See if you can read that with me. 4 It says, "It's important to note we have 15:38:03 5 spent 16 years gathering insights and perfecting 6 ExtraCare," that's what they call it, which means that no 7 competitor can match the depth of our customer analytics. 8 They analyze everything their customer does. 9 We've leveraged our ExtraCare insights to 15:38:27 10 convert customers to categories they shop elsewhere, to 11 launch personalized digital circulars. They have so much 12 of your data, they can figure out what they want to 13 target you to buy there because you're not buying and "To 14 tailor our merchandise mix to better meet our customer 15:38:51 15 needs." 16 That's the reason we get these receipts 17 from some of these stores that have all these tailor-made 18 coupons. 19 You know, where the data makes money, data 15:39:10 20 is king or queen. But where it doesn't make money, it's 21 the next episode, it's Less Info, Not More. 22 My microphone is doing what? It went out. 23 I apologize. 24 Less info. Not more. See, it -- it wasn't

profitable to follow the law. It was not profitable to

15:39:43 25

follow the law.

15:41:31 25

15:41:02 20

15:40:45 15

15:40:01 5

15:40:30 10

The evidence is going to show you that they could make money by selling. They could make money by selling the pills, they could make money by selling the data, but to put the data together simply for their pharmacists to use, to reject people's purchases, to sell less, not more, that doesn't make money.

There's something you're going to learn about. We'll put it under the microscope. PDMP, Prescription Drug Monitoring Program. I'm sorry to hit you with all of this. Don't worry about it. This trial's going to take awhile. I'll remind you about all of this stuff. By the time of closing argument, you're going to say this is where he talks about PDMPs. It will just roll off your tongue. Won't be a problem. Okay? You have to bear with me so I don't need to throw things at you too much.

But the Prescription Drug Monitoring
Program, PDMP, every state in the union's got one now.
Finally. Thank you, Missouri. They were slow to come around, but Ohio's had one for a long time and it's changed over the years, but what the PDMP does is it provides data. It provides data to the pharmacists who can get on a computer and find out if someone's been filling too many prescriptions.

1 Now, I'm not talking about something 2 internal to CVS, Giant Eagle, Walgreen's, Walmart. I'm 3 not talking about what they could have developed on their 4 own and should have developed alongside with their 15:41:47 5 programs that get you to buy diapers or whatever you're 6 there to buy or not there to buy. 7 But I'm saying that the states themselves even had programs. Here's what they did. The states 8 9 would have a program, and it would be a computerized 15:42:07 10 program where you've got a little bit of a lag time but 11 where you're able to, every pharmacy is supposed to enter 12 into the database information about these prescriptions, 13 these controlled substances specifically here. 14 And then doctors are told before you write 15:42:26 15 a prescription, you should check the program to see if 16 this is a problem patient, to see if there's any 17 information about this situation that should keep you 18 from writing that prescription. And when she checks or 19 he checks, they find out. 15:42:42 20 But corresponding responsibility, the 21 pharmacists are supposed to check, also. Of course, that 22 requires that they have a computer that's hooked in. 23 That requires they have the time to do it.

That requires that they work for a business who tells

them "This is important. We have a covenant with the

24

15:43:07 25

community. We have a community obligation. We need to do this right." And you need to work for that kind of a business to do it.

Instead, what the evidence is going to be is that these companies fought against this type of information, against PDMPs. And when Ohio moved, one, from being voluntary to being mandatory, they were not happy. Great. Another unfunded mandate from the Government.

When there was talk about a national database, you know, you take counties like Lake and Trumbull, each of them just one county removed from Pennsylvania, so to just look at Ohio data and not look at Pennsylvania data? That's not optimal. So when there was talk about putting a national program together that would catch Florida, would catch Ohio, what did the companies do? They don't want to have anything to do with it.

Now, they can't comfortably come out real publicly and say that so instead they have other groups that will vote against it and they acknowledge privately in the e-mails, don't worry, our name won't be on it, because this data costs them money, because it costs them time.

They don't make money. So they -- they are

15:43:48 10

15:43:27 5

15:44:09 15

15:44:28 20

15:44:44 25

all for Less Info, Not More.

15:46:27 25

15:46:06 20

15:45:47 15

15:45:08 5

15:45:31 10

All right. I got to move faster. New episode. Horse or Zebra? This episode came to me when I was in the checkout line at the grocery store. And this lady in front of me had enough groceries to where I was standing there for a long time. And I started looking at all of the magazines and stuff right there, and I see one of these puzzle booklets and it had a puzzle of connect the dots. These were complicated. It's not like this one I'm about to show you. This one, Rachel found that. That's an easy one. All right?

I'm talking really complicated like you're looking at it, you have no clue what this thing is.

You're filling in the dots like number 179, 180, 223, and finally you connect the dots and you have this very elaborate picture.

Well, I used to do connect the dots when I was in elementary school, and it's not hard. You just follow the rule, connect the dots. If there's a dot with a number, you connect it.

If you don't connect all the dots, you don't get the whole picture. Now, we've got an opioid epidemic. We've got what I think the law defines as a nuisance, but it's cataclysmic. And we've got to figure out the whole picture of who all's responsible, and I

1 promise you we can detail a bunch of people and I promise 2 you when they get up here, they are going to be pointing 3 the finger everywhere except themselves. 4 But you got to connect all the dots to get the picture. 15:46:49 5 6 You can connect some of the dots, but if 7 you just connect some of the dots, you might walk away thinking you've got a horse. Because you left out some 8 9 of the dots. You got to pick up the other dots. And 15:47:04 10 when you pick up the other dots, all of a sudden, you 11 realize you don't have a horse, you've got a zebra. 12 You can't get the whole picture and leave 13 out the pharmacies. And they're going to say, "Yeah, 14 but, look, we didn't distribute as much as these other 15:47:23 15 pharmacies did and they're not in here." 16 That's not the issue. The issue is did you 17 distribute enough to where you're a significant contributor to the problem. And if you did, then you 18 19 need to be in here. 15:47:38 20 Every time I walk in and out of this 21 courthouse, I see that bridge and it's got, like, blue on 22 the bottom for the trestles or whatever I think they're 23 called, they're blue and I hope to heaven that those

folks put the steel in there to code and followed the law

because if two or three or four or five percent of those

24

15:47:57 25

15:49:42 25

15:49:22 20

15:49:02 15

15:48:20 5

15:48:35 10

trestles are bad, and that bridge goes out, no one should be allowed to say, "Well, hey, I only did five percent of the trestles."

The opioid crisis is one of connected dots, and to get the whole picture, you need these national pharmacies.

Now, we're unique here. We've got three national pharmacies, and we've got a local pharmacy. The national pharmacies in a sense have an even greater obligation because they are so tough and big that others have to compete with them. Think about Walmart for a moment. Here we go, Walmart, back there. Walmart is able to make money. Good. Selling automotive parts, selling furniture, selling groceries, selling clothes, selling electronics, selling sporting goods, selling gas, they're able to make money selling pharmaceuticals. They can make money selling all of this stuff and they're leaders.

And if you take a mom-and-pop pharmacy, how is a mom-and-pop pharmacy going to compete against the big leader if the big leader's cutting corners? If the big leader doesn't have the programs in place, if the big leader's not putting enough pharmacists in to take their time to screen right, how are the mom-and-pops supposed to compete? They can't.

1 That might mean more business for the 2 Walmarts and Walgreens, the CVSes, but I'm saying that 3 they, those big national chains have an even greater 4 responsibility in the way they conduct their business. And they are a significant part of this problem, even 15:50:01 5 6 beyond how many stores are in one county. And I'll tell 7 you why I believe that later but right now, that's the Horse or Zebra episode. 8 Let me get to episode seven, the Aftermath. 9 15:50:19 10 The Aftermath of the actions of these companies 11 especially back in the early 2000s, mid 2000s, into the 12 2000, early teens, the aftermath is entirely foreseeable. 13 They knew this was coming. They knew that 14 this would be a problem. Plaintiffs' Trial Exhibit 15:50:50 15 19693, Juan, if we could go to this, please. This is a 16 PowerPoint by Walgreen's. It is entitled, "The Opioid Crisis." 17 18 Now, this is their policy discussing PDMPs, 19 Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs. In the process of this, the company recognizes, "Drug overdose deaths have 15:51:12 20 21 reached epidemic proportions in the United States." 22 "According to HHS," a Government agency, 23 "175 people die daily from the drug crisis." 24 "Since 1999, the number of American 15:51:36 25 overdose deaths involving opioids quadrupled."

"Approximately 6 in 10 drug overdose deaths 1 involved opioids." 2 3 "Prescription or synthetic opioid pain 4 relievers were implicated in more than two-thirds of 15:51:56 5 those overdose deaths." "Currently, U.S. pharmacies dispense more 6 7 than 650,000 opioid prescriptions on an average day." Walgreen's went on to say Americans consume 8 more opioids than any other country, and it's not even 15:52:23 10 close. 11 So the companies knew that this was going 12 They knew about the effects of abuse. This wasn't 13 something that was new to them. This is something where, 14 in 2013, Walgreen's puts out a PowerPoint that's 15:52:44 15 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 14746, "Pharmaceutical integrity." 16 And in 2013, they talked about the national 17 prescription drug epidemic, how dramatic increases in the 18 use of, and addiction to, controlled substance 19 pharmaceuticals had been seen for two decades. 15:53:05 20 Prescription drug abuse increases traffic 21 accidents, it increases crime, it increases overdoses, it 22 increases death. You'll hear about this in these 23 counties. This is the nuisance, or so the law calls it. 2.4 This is the tragedy, as I call it. Whether it's doped up 15:53:28 25 people at a traffic accident or doped up people

15:55:01 25

15:54:42 20

15:54:23 15

15:53:46 5

15:54:07 10

committing crime because they want -- they're having to buy the stuff off the streets, overdoses where you've got first responders who are there having to give the Narcan or give something to try to save the lives and ultimately, sometimes not getting there on time and the deaths. All of this was foreseeable. That's a legal word -- not legal, but legal in this sense because the Judge will, I expect, charge you that you need to determine whether or not the actions and the results and consequences were a foreseeable part of those actions.

And I think that you'll find that they are.

If you go back to the PowerPoint, please,

Juan.

Over time, a lot of these people have migrated from the opioids they were first able to get quite easy to other opioids that are more difficult to get and more dangerous to take. And so if you look at the deaths in the last couple of years, more of the opioid deaths are from the illegal drugs. This is the stuff being hauled over from Mexico or wherever it may be coming from.

And it pipelines up into Ohio just like the Florida stuff does. But this is where some people are turning because now the spigot has been tightened and there's not enough money to put people into drug

treatment programs.

2.4

15:56:20 25

15:56:06 20

15:55:48 15

15:55:15 5

15:55:31 10

Okay. But I'm sure people have to want to go into those, first, for those to work. I'm not an expert in that, but I know that you need those programs and they need to be funded.

And this is the way that these drugs open the door to others.

Now, what we've done is we're bringing in a witness. His name is Craig McCann. He's a Ph.D. He's a numbers geek. He looks at computer numbers and he's — we've been able by His Honor's rulings, we've been able to get all of the Government numbers on this stuff and been able to figure out who's been writing the prescriptions and how many they've been writing and where those drugs are from.

And so we've got that information and we've got that, and that's what Dr. McCann does; he analyzes that data to present it in court because I can't just give you a computer program and say here, look at all these ones and zeros and dips and dots. I mean it's tough to do.

So he's analyzed all of that data. And he's investigated the distributor defendants, not their behavior. He's not a behavioralist. He's not able to say oh, they did wrong here or they did right there.

He's just a numbers geek.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

15:57:36 25

15:57:19 20

15:57:03 15

15:56:36 5

15:56:49 10

But he investigated their behavior through the numbers, how many prescriptions were they filling, and he's going to testify to that amount. He's going to say, all right, someone else tell me what the red flags are.

And we'll have Carmen Catizone and others explain the red flags, which prescriptions the pharmacy should have said, "Time out. Before I just fill this I need to make sure it's legitimate." And that's like 90 percent of these prescriptions. I mean it's just really high because this is a really dangerous drug, set of drugs.

And then they filter through. They screen through them and figure out what ones are legitimate and which aren't. And so what Dr. McCann does is he analyzes those amounts and he gives those amounts of their failures, based upon what he's told are the suspicious orders.

He's not qualified to testify about suspicious orders.

We've also called what's called an epidemiologist. An epidemiologist is someone who studies large groups and numbers. Katherine Keyes is an epidemiologist. She's at Columbia University in New York

1 City, and she's got a specialty for substance use. 2 she's going to testify how the oversupply led to 3 diversion, which leads to harm. In other words, you put 4 too many pills out there, some of those pills are going 15:58:00 5 to be diverted, and that diversion is going to lead to 6 harm. 7 And she helps link up those chains. And that's what she does. 8 And so this is what you've got. You've got 9 15:58:13 10 a foreseeable situation. If we go back to the 11 PowerPoint, please, Juan. 12 You know, I was interested to see there is 13 a witness named Nicole Harrington that I believe the 14 defendants are going to call, and she worked at CVS, and 15:58:30 15 she is one of the people on this PowerPoint. It's Nicole 16 Harrington and Angela Nelson PowerPoint that CVS did. And in this PowerPoint, "Our communities, 17 18 Our Responsibilities," there are some provisions that 19 you'll get to see and I hope one of them will do this, 15:58:56 20 and oh, I'm sorry. For the Court, this would be 21 Plaintiffs' 459. 22 This document, "Our Communities, Our 23 Responsibilities," the company, CVS here, knew that drug 24 overdoses kill more than cars, guns and falling. You got

41,000 deaths from drug overdoses. That's more than

15:59:17 25

1 traffic, more than guns, more than falling. 2 You've got 52 million people over the age 3 of 12 have used prescription drugs nonmedically in their 4 lifetime. 15:59:34 5 And what I really find interesting about 6 this presentation as opposed to what you're being told in 7 court is the next slide because it's the talking notes that go with this. And actually, Ms. Harrington is going 8 to say, "I didn't write those notes." I don't know which 9 15:59:54 10 one of them did, which one of them didn't, but I sure 11 hope whoever wrote it will come to court and testify 12 about what they meant when they said it. 13 "One in four teams have reported that they 14 misused or abused a prescription drug at least once in 16:00:11 15 their lifetimes." 16 More people die every year than get killed 17 in a car wreck. Now, look at the bottom here. "When I 18 started to really understand the tremendous growth of the 19 misuse of prescription drugs, I realized I may have been 16:00:32 20 naive to believe we were doing everything we could to 21 reduce the growth of this tragic problem in the U.S." 22 They're going to tell you, "We did 23 everything we could," but they internally know they 24 didn't, at least this witness -- bless you -- does.

And so you're going to get to hear this.

16:00:50 25

1 You're going to get to hear this. This, by the way, 2 dates back to 2015, dates back to 2015. You're going to 3 hear how these companies understood what would happen, 4 how foreseeable this was, even the entry into heroin. So, for example, here's a 2013 document, 16:01:08 5 which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 20757, and this is a Giant 6 7 Eagle document talking about pharmacy compliance, and even Giant Eagle, though they are regional, they 8 9 recognized, "Prescription drug abuse epidemic. In 2009, 16:01:35 10 deaths from prescription drug overdoses exceeded deaths 11 from auto accidents for the first time ever. 12 "Over 20 percent of Americans admit to 13 abusing prescription drugs. 14 "Prescription drugs are now the recognized 16:01:50 15 gateway drugs to heroin and other illegal drugs." 16 Again, different usage of the word 17 "Gateway." But they recognize that you move from one opiate to another when costs or availability are 18 19 involved. So these companies, from the biggest to the 16:02:06 20 21 smallest, understood how predictable this was, and that's 22 where we end up there with the aftermath. 23 Now, episode number eight, as we're drawing 24 our binge watching to a close, is The Blame Game, and 16:02:23 25 this is what you're going to see. And the Judge requires 16:03:56 25

16:03:32 20

16:03:13 15

16:02:37 5

16:02:57 10

both sides to exchange their slides for opening beforehand, and so I've seen their slides, and you'll get to see their slides when they present them. I'm not going to spoil it and tell you what they're going to say.

But I am going to tell you to be on the lookout, be on the lookout for slides where they're trying to blame everybody but themselves. They would almost have you believe that a pharmacist is a gum ball machine. They would almost have you believe that a pharmacist is simply there to take your money and to spit out your pills.

That's not the law. That's not why pharmacists go to pharmacy school. That's not why they take these classes.

You know, I said before, no doctor should be writing a prescription for a Benzo and an opiate. One of our lawyers pointed out to me that I said that inartfully. I was not speaking correctly. It does happen, and it is appropriate on rare occasions, but it should be a dynamite red flag. There's three drugs in combination that are called the unholy trinity or some people call it the holy trinity.

I can't go there, but this, these drugs, add a muscle relaxant and they just shouldn't be -- I mean people are taking them for a trip, they're not

taking them for medicinal reasons.

16:05:25 25

16:05:09 20

16:04:40 15

16:04:10 5

16:04:20 10

And this is well-known and it's well-published in the literature, but you've got to give the data to the pharmacists for them to be able to figure it out.

If people are coming from several different doctors, you've got to get the data to the pharmacists for them to be able to figure it out.

And it doesn't matter how big you are or how small you are, if you're going to make money doing this, you've got to be able to figure it out. And you can't be a Giant Eagle who says, "Yeah, but we're four generations of happiness and community values" when you don't even have a program in place to monitor for suspicious orders until 2013. Nothing. Zippo. Nada.

And you can't just start blaming everybody else without also accepting some responsibility. Don't get me wrong, I'm all for blaming all of them. Let's figure out what went wrong. But we don't give a get-out-of-jail-free card and a pass to this group and ignore the zebra. The Blame Game.

Now, our last episode I want to talk to you about is a Seedy Past, because I've looked at their slides and I suspect you will hear evidence and you will hear statements that blame a lot of this on Perdue.

16:07:20 25

16:06:55 20

16:06:33 15

16:05:50 5

16:06:11 10

Perdue Pharma. Perdue, who invented OxyContin in a sense and really marketed the dog out of it. And they did some outrageous stuff in the marketing, and they seduced an entire medical community into thinking for a while these drugs aren't addictive.

And what they did in my opinion is fraudulent and it's horrible and it's terrible and I can't say enough bad about it, but they couldn't have done it successfully if other people had followed the rules and the law.

And instead, what you've got is you've got people like CVS who jump into partnership with Perdue and actually help sponsor programs where Perdue sends people out to the pharmacists to convince the pharmacists these drugs are okay; just let them go. It's a gum ball machine, let them go.

These companies get into relationships with these drug manufacturers, and you're going to hear about them. These companies get together, all of them, including Giant Eagle, and join these trade groups like the National Association of Chain Drug Stores that fight against legislation that would make PDMPs out there for everybody, that fight for legislation that put handcuffs on the DEA and their ability to chase and police the Marino Bill you'll hear about.

1 So you're going to hear about all of these 2 things. You're going to watch all of these episodes 3 unfold. You're going to see what they have to say. And 4 then after you watch it, you get to talk about it. 16:07:35 5 You all will go back in the jury room and 6 you'll get to talk about it; not until then. But when 7 you talk about it, you've got to try and frame this evidence. And so when I present this evidence, I'm going 8 to try to present it in ways that make it easier for you 16:07:56 10 to discuss it later. 11 So you will hear the evidence coming in in 12 ways, this is like my best friend right here. This is called an Ipevo because I'm a visual guy and so I like to 13 14 see things and I draw them and I write them down and I'll 16:08:10 15 just apologize to you now. Unless you're a visual 16 learner, then you won't mind. 17 If we're questioning from back there, the 18 Court's got their own already hard wired into the system, 19 though it's made by Wolfe, not Optico, but I'll do that because I want you to categorize and listen to this 16:08:27 20 21 evidence coming in in the ways that will enable you to 22 talk about it. 23 And the Judge has told but the burden of 24 I don't need to tell you about that anymore but I

do need to tell you what's going to happen when I sit

16:08:39 25

1 down because this is the rest of the opening statement 2 that comes from the other sides. 3 They're entitled to -- look, my view of 4 this is again, not one thing I've said is evidence. These documents, if they're admitted into evidence, will 16:08:56 5 6 be evidence. But right now, I've just read them. They 7 haven't been formally admitted yet. So you're hearing my view of the truth. 8 9 Now, I'd be a fool to stand up here and tell you 16:09:11 10 something I didn't think I could prove. But the other 11 side, this is a court system. They get to tell their 12 side of things. And we listen and we assess, and that's 13 the right thing to do, to talk about it. 14 But when this is happening, as you're 16:09:29 15 listening to this evidence unfold, I want to give you a 16 couple of things to look at and think about. 17 Juan, if we could go to the -- thank you, 18 you're already ahead of me. 19 One, beware of math. You say wait, two 16:09:49 20 plus two is four, why do I need to beware of that? Yes, 21 two plus two is four. That's fine. You can grab that 22 math and run all the way to the bank but people start 23 doing things with math where they've got access to data 24 that you don't have.

So, for example, if someone is going to get

16:10:06 25

16:11:35 25

16:11:20 20

16:11:05 15

16:10:28 5

16:10:45 10

up and compare one of their stores to one of the big local stores, there was a store called Overholt's that for a while, for a couple of years, sold a lot of opiates. That's a pharmacy. They sold them badly and wrongly and they'll — be aware of anybody who tries to compare themselves to Overholt's in ways that make them look good because the math may not be so right.

And I'll talk about that as the trial unfolds because you've got to be careful of anybody who is cherry-picking data to talk about.

Hold me accountable, but hold everybody accountable because it's going to take me awhile to go through the evidence. See, the Judge calls — has us call witnesses and we call those witnesses, but after the opening statement that I give, they get to respond.

After their opening statement, I don't respond until closing argument. So I'll respond by putting it on through the evidence. So when you hear something, don't hesitate. If you want to make a note, make a note. I'll be making notes because I'm going to disassemble it all with the evidence as this trial unfolds.

You know, for example, cherry-picking, pick the store that's got the least amount of sales and compare it to the store with the most amount of sales.

16:13:17 25

16:12:50 20

16:12:26 15

16:11:50 5

16:12:10 10

Pick the year that works best for you, not the year that works worst. Pick the policy that you followed, not telling them you didn't follow it until it was too little too late. That type of cherry-picking we'll look at together.

I want you to be aware of dosing. This is something you're going to hear about in this trial. The difference between an MME and a dose. So one of the big opiates is Morphine. And one of the ways you can measure the potency of an opiate is how equivalent it is to Morphine.

That's the MME. But that doesn't really help you if you're trying to count how many doses people sell. And the reason that becomes important is because I just did a little look-see. Doses versus MMEs, Morphine Milligram Equivalents. And here's an example. There's a store called Franklin. Bad store.

Franklin, an independent store, sold 9.5 million doses but that translates into 241 milligrams of Morphine equivalents. Well, you then take Overholt's which sold 6.5 million and that translates to 176. Why isn't it the same? Because sometimes they're selling a dose of Oxy 30. Sometimes they're selling a dose of Oxy 90. Ninety's got three times as much Morphine equivalents even though it's one dose. Or they might be

1 selling Fentanyl for a cancer patient and it's got a 2 Morphine equivalent that's huge compared to the 3 OxyContin. 4 And so these are just different ways of looking at it and you'll hear about it. 16:13:28 5 You'll hear that CVS in their eleven stores 6 7 in these two counties sold 27.4 million doses, but if you look at the grass on the other side, they're not going to 8 show you that. They're going to cherry-pick a store here 16:13:43 10 and a store there. 11 And so this is the kind of stuff that 12 you'll hear about. Walgreen's, Giant Eagle, 28.4, more than CVS. Walgreen's, more than both of them. Walmart 13 14 still at 8.9 million, just their four stores. 16:14:01 15 So we'll walk through that together through 16 the trial. It's through the trial you'll hear that 17 evidence. 18 But when you hear it in openings, just keep 19 a list of things like that that you want to talk about. Beware of dates because this is the screen size issue I 16:14:14 20 21 talked to you about. 22 They would change screen sizes depending 23 upon how closely the DEA was watching, whether they've 24 been sued, whether they were under an agreement to do 16:14:30 25 some things differently. Those screens changed with

times so beware of the dates.

16:15:52 25

16:15:37 20

16:15:24 15

16:14:49 5

16:15:11 10

And finally, beware of the half story.

Every witness will take an oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and half stories are dangerous. Half stories are things like "It was a beautiful day and then the tornado hit." Well, you can't start that sentence with, "It was a great day."

"It was the best of times and it was the worst of times." You can't start that with, "It was the best of times." You get the whole picture.

So that's what you'll have a chance to listen to and you'll do it. And then ultimately, I'll take those charts that I kept putting up there that you heard about, and I'll put them down with the witnesses and I'll ask the CVS witness, "Did you develop a system before you started selling this drug or distributing this drug, did you develop a system to blah, blah, blah," and we'll talk about it, and that's what the evidence will unfold.

So, Your Honor, I think I'm close to my time being out, but I think I've given you back 15 minutes and so I'm out of soap.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being attentive. It's just amazing, and it's hard to do and I'm greatly appreciative on behalf of my clients and on

	$\mathbf{I}$
1	behalf of myself.
2	So with that, Your Honor, I'm done.
3	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lanier.
4	Okay. We'll have whichever defendant
16:16:07 5	wishes to begin.
6	OPENING STATEMENTS ON BEHALF OF WALGREEN'S
7	MR. STOFFELMAYR: Yes, Your Honor. Kaspar
8	Stoffelmayr for Walgreen's. We will go first.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Stoffelmayr.
16:16:16 10	MR. STOFFELMAYR: Let me take one second to
11	get set up, if I may.
12	THE COURT: That's fine.
13	MR. STOFFELMAYR: Your Honor, may I ask you
14	are you going until 5:00 or 5:30 today?
16:17:51 15	THE COURT: Mr. Stoffelmayr, we'll see how
16	it goes and when's a reasonable break.
17	How long you go, I mean, I don't want to
18	cut anyone off in the middle, I don't think that's fair,
19	but how long are you planning to go?
16:18:02 20	MR. STOFFELMAYR: I may go as long as an
21	hour. I'd like to be shorter than that.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Well, we'll certainly
23	finish yours.
24	MR. STOFFELMAYR: Okay. Thank you, Your
16:18:09 25	Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. And then if you go, if
2	you take an hour, we'll stop for the day.
3	MR. STOFFELMAYR: Great. Thank you.
4	All right. May it please the Court,
16:18:21 5	counsel, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Kaspar
6	Stoffelmayr, and I represent Walgreen's.
7	I want to say something right off the bat.
8	It is a real honor, a real pleasure to be able to address
9	you, to stand in front of you.
16:18:44 10	It's especially an honor because I
11	represent a company of pharmacists who minutes ago were
12	compared to gum ball machines. That's not who Walgreen's
13	is. That's not how Walgreen's operates. That's not who
14	our pharmacists are.
16:19:01 15	And you're going to get a chance to meet
16	some of them before this case is over.
17	First people I want you to meet, though,
18	are some of my colleagues.
19	You met earlier Peter Wilson. He's a
16:19:13 20	lawyer who works at Walgreen's. Some of you met during
21	jury selection my law partner, Brian Swanson. He will be
22	here for the whole trial. Mr. Wilson may he'll be
23	here today, he'll be here tomorrow, and then he may come
24	and go as the trial progresses.
16:19:27 25	And also our partner, Kate Swift. And

there are some other members of our team who I hope you'll get to know before the case is over.

There were a lot of statements made, but one thing I want to make really clear to everybody from the outset, nobody here, not on behalf of Walgreen's or anybody else, is here to tell you that the opioids crisis is unimportant, that it's not serious; that it hasn't had horrifying consequences for some communities.

You just saw some PowerPoint presentations, internal PowerPoint presentations from Walgreen's, and I don't know if you noticed the dates. They go back to 2013, one I did notice, long before this stuff was on the front page of the newspaper every day, a long time before anyone was filing lawsuits about it. The people at Walgreen's were enormously concerned about the misuse of opioid drugs.

They were thinking about it and talking about it internally and worried about it and worried about what they needed to do going back years and years and years before you saw it on the front page of the paper every day.

I think that's the best evidence that, as I said, nobody's here to try to tell you this isn't a big deal.

This trial is about more than that, though,

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

16:19:48 5

19

21

22

23

24

16:20:49 25

of course, right? This trial is about more than is there a crisis and is it terrible. I don't think anyone disagrees with that.

What this trial is about is what happened. How did we get here? And when people come to court and file lawsuits and try to figure out who to blame, are they looking in the right places?

There's no question, no dispute that
Walgreen's, all these pharmacy chains carry these
medicines. Every pharmacy in America just about carries
these medicines and has carried these medicines for ages,
but what Judge Polster said, I wrote down the exact words
he used, "What you'll need to figure out is were these
pharmacy chains," not pharmacies in general, not all of
these pharmacies somehow together, but individual, were
these pharmacies, the word he used was, "a substantial
factor in creating a public nuisance."

At the end of the case, the Court's going to give you legal instructions on exactly what counts as a substantial factor versus not a substantial factor, what counts as a public nuisance versus just something that's upsetting but doesn't count legally as a public nuisance.

All right. So this trial, as I was saying, this is not the first time people in Ohio have asked

16:21:10 5

16:21:25 10

16:21:46 15

16:22:00 20

16:22:46 25

about the reasons we have this crisis of the misuse of prescription drugs.

You have on the screen now, it is this document. It was the final report of the Ohio Prescription Drug Abuse Task Force. This came out in 2010. And what happened was that the Governor at the time, it was Governor Strickland, issued an executive order creating this task force and the goal of this task force was to address exactly the question that brings us here today: Prescription drug abuse.

And the task force members were appointed by the Governor. They weren't lawyers filing lawsuits.

The task force members were representatives from the Ohio Department of Public Safety, from the Ohio Department -- excuse me -- of Health, the Attorney General's Office, the Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, lots of people from law enforcement, representatives of health care organizations, representatives of county Government.

And when these people all came together, public officials, when they came together, they identified what they thought were the contributing factors to fatal drug overdose death rates.

And what you'll see is they didn't think pharmacies, certainly not well-run chain pharmacies, were

16:23:22 10

16:23:05 5

16:23:41 15

16:23:55 20

16:24:17 25

1 a problem in Ohio. So going counterclockwise from the 2 body, the self medicating habits of Baby Boomers -- I 3 apologize this isn't a better company. This is what the 4 original looks like, unfortunately. Self medicating habits of Baby Boomers. 16:24:31 5 6 Direct-to-consumer marketing. That's like when you see 7 ads on TV or magazines for prescription drugs. Aggressive marketing of opioids. That's marketing to 8 doctors when drug companies, pharmaceutical manufacturers 16:24:48 10 market to doctors. 11 Then you go on, you've got changes in 12 clinical pain management. We're going to talk about that a little bit more but that's changes in how doctors, how 13 14 doctors treated pain. 16:25:02 15 We've got the growing use of prescription 16 opioids. Doctors were prescribing a lot more 17 prescription opioids by 2010. 18 And then finally you get to diversion. All 19 right. Mr. Lanier talked a lot about diversion and I 16:25:17 20 agree with certainly some of the things he said. 21 Diversion, we're talking about drugs getting into the 22 hands of the wrong people, people who shouldn't have them 23 who are going to use them in ways the drugs shouldn't be 2.4 used. 16:25:27 25 There's a few different things. The

1 Internet. Back then people actually used to be able to 2 order opioid medications on the Internet. People did It was a huge problem. Congress stopped that. 3 4 Next we've got pill mills. So we have pill mills and people use that term a little loosely but we're 16:25:45 5 6 talking about doctors who will prescribe drugs to anybody 7 for cash. And back then, a lot of times, the doctor would also give you the pills. It was a doctor/pharmacy 8 9 all in one. 16:25:58 10 You heard Mr. Lanier talking about pain 11 clinics in Florida. That's what was going on. You would 12 go, get your prescription and get your pills; one-stop 13 shopping. 14 That never happened in one of these 16:26:08 15 pharmacies here in court. 16 If you go down, it is deception and scams. 17 Yeah, there's a lot of scamming that has gone on, people 18 trying to get pills. Pharmacies are the victims of the 19 scamming. They're not the ones doing the scamming. 16:26:25 20 Theft, same thing. There has been theft. 21 Yeah, there's armed robberies at pharmacies. Pharmacies 22 are the victims; not the people doing the theft. 23 And finally, you get to friends and family 24 and I'm going to talk about that before the -- before the 16:26:38 25 day is over. But as it turns out, I'll just preview it.

1 There's a lot of unused pills in medicine 2 cabinets in America, and a lot of those pills get into 3 the wrong hands. It's an unfortunate fact but that's, I 4 think, what they are talking about when they are saying 16:26:57 5 friends and family. 6 So this is what happens when public 7 officials in Ohio come together to try to do their job and try to do their very best to figure out what are the 8 9 factors that contributed to the misuse of prescription 16:27:11 10 drugs in Ohio. 11 Again, it's not chain pharmacies. 12 With the rest of my time, and I'm not going 13 to go for two-and-a-half hours, I promise you, nothing 14 like that. For the rest of the time, I want to address 16:27:25 15 three topics with you. 16 The first one, oops, I tripped. First one 17 is why are there so many pills? You are going to hear 18 from some of the experts in the case, Mr. Lanier 19 mentioned Dr. Keyes, the epidemiologist from Columbia 16:27:41 20 University. You are going to hear from some people that 21 when there are more pills, more bad things happen. 22 The more pills there are in a community, 23 the more addiction there can be, the more overdoses there 24 can be, and the terrible things that happen with that.

So you have to ask yourself why are there so many pills.

16:27:59 25

16:29:14 25

16:28:59 20

16:28:42 15

16:28:17 5

16:28:33 10

The next thing I want to talk about is what do pharmacists really do? Who are they? They are not gum ball machines. I promise you. What do pharmacists do and how do they do their job and what is their role in protecting patients and the community?

And then the last thing we'll talk about is where do diverted pills for these two counties, Lake and Trumbull Counties, that's what we are talking about.

We're talking about diversion, diverted pills available to people in Lake and Trumbull Counties, where do they really come from?

Many pills and Mr. Lanier talked about this a little bit and it is absolutely true that if you go back to the 1980s, for example, opioid medicines were not used very much. They were used, some of the medicines that are most popular today didn't exist back then, but some of them did. There were other opioids. But these opioid pain medications were used much less frequently in the 1980s and earlier. And there are lots of reasons for that. I think Dr. Lembke, who is going to testify, may talk about this.

And there's been a big change. Starting in the 1990s and early in the 2000s, there was a huge change in how doctors treat pain. And at the end of the day,

1 the question is why are there so many pills? The answer 2 is amazingly simple: Because doctors write so many 3 prescriptions. 4 They didn't used to, and now they do. Now they write fewer than they did five or six years ago. 16:29:29 5 6 Some people, as you heard a little bit 7 about, some people blame pharmaceutical manufacturers. They think the problem is that pharmaceutical 8 manufacturers tricked, deceived doctors into writing way 16:29:46 10 too many of these pills, tricked doctors into thinking 11 that these pills are much safer than they are. 12 And as Mr. Lanier previewed for you, 13 because he had my slides, as Mr. Lanier previewed for 14 you, these lawyers here, before they filed the 16:30:05 15 pharmacies, filed lawsuits against pharmacies, were 16 filing lawsuits against drug manufacturers. In 2000 -- in 2018, both Lake and Trumbull 17 Counties filed lawsuits. These are 267 pages long. 18 19 They're identical. Both counties filed the same lawsuit. 16:30:27 20 The counties filed these lawsuits back in, 21 like I say, 2018 and here's what they were saying before they sued pharmacies. 22 23 They said that defendants in those cases, 24 the defendants in those cases were pharmaceutical 16:30:42 25 manufacturers, and also some of these big wholesalers but

not pharmacies. "Defendants engaged in a sophisticated 1 2 and highly deceptive and unfair marketing campaign to 3 sell opioid medicines." 4 They went on and said that these defendants, these pharmaceutical manufacturers, spent 16:31:00 5 hundreds of millions of dollars on that deceptive 6 7 marketing campaign. And it goes on and on with the details. As 8 9 I said, these are 267 pages long. If we had more time 16:31:19 10 today, you could hear more about this but that is what 11 folks were saying, these lawyers were saying before they 12 sued pharmacies. 13 Now, that marketing campaign is not the 14 only thing going on, obviously that changed the way 16:31:35 15 doctors treat medicine. 16 I want to show you a few slides and you'll 17 see more and more about them as this case goes on and I 18 think Dr. Lembke may be able to talk about this. 19 Other things that were going on. In 1997, 16:31:51 20 the State of Ohio passed this law. This was the law in 21 Ohio passed by the state legislature. And here's what 22 they said. "The State Medical Board shall adopt rules in 23 accordance, at that time, with standards and procedures 24 to be followed by physicians in the diagnosis and

treatment of intractable pain." Later they changed the

16:32:08 25

1 wording there to "chronic pain." You can just think of 2 it as pain that doesn't go away, pain that continues for 3 weeks, months, years. 4 The medical board had to come up with standards for treating intractable pain by prescribing, 16:32:25 5 6 dispensing, administering dangerous drugs. That's a word 7 the law used to use. They used to say dangerous drugs. That includes opioid medicines, that includes dangerous 8 9 drugs when the law used that word. 16:32:42 10 They were supposed to dispense, administer, 11 prescribe dangerous drugs in amounts or combinations that 12 may not be appropriate when treating other medical 13 conditions. 14 Okay. That was the law in Ohio starting from 1997. Here's some other things that were happening. 16:32:54 15 16 You heard a reference along the way, I 17 think, "pain is the fifth vital sign." Some of you may 18 have heard this expression before, some of you not. This 19 is an idea where people started talking about in the: 16:33:10 20 It really became popular around 2000. This is 21 the document in front of me, Department of Veterans 22 Affairs. You know, the agency of the Federal Government 23 that, among other things, runs the V.A. medical system to 24 take care of our veterans. 16:33:24 25 And this was a tool kit to help people in

1 the V.A. system, the doctors, the nurses, the others, 2 understand this idea that pain is the fifth vital sign. 3 And I want to pause for a second. What does that mean 4 that pain is a vital sign? What they meant by this is this: A heart rate is a vital sign, pain is a vital 16:33:45 5 6 sign. Anyone who comes into an emergency room or a 7 doctor's office, they will check your pulse. They need to know your pulse. And if there's something wrong, if 8 9 your pulse is very unique or highly elevated for some 16:34:03 10 reason, they're going to address it. They're not just 11 going to ignore that there's a problem with your pulse. 12 They are saying take the same approach to 13 pain. Treat pain like a vital sign so if somebody comes 14 into the office, somebody comes into your emergency room, 16:34:19 15 you need to find out if that person is in pain just the 16 way you want to find out what their pulse is. And if 17 that person is in pain, you need to address it, you need to offer treatment just the way you would never ignore 18 19 somebody who got a problem with their pulse. 16:34:32 20 That's what this idea was with pain as the 21 fifth vital sign. It became popular obviously not just 22 at the V.A. Hospitals. 23 In 2000, the Joint Commission, this is -- issues pain standards. The Joint Commission is the 24

organization that sets the standards to accredit

16:35:15 25

1 hospitals in America. Essentially, every hospital in 2 America that wants to be accredited, that's all of them, 3 has to comply with the standards set by the Joint 4 Commission. And in 2001, for the very first time, they 16:35:30 5 6 issued pain standards. And the leading point is this: 7 Patients have a right to appropriate assessment and management of their pain. 8 9 That might seem obvious to some people but 16:35:45 10 in 2001, this was a directive that hospitals hadn't heard 11 before, and they reacted to it. They needed to come up 12 with training programs so that their doctors and nurses 13 and other providers would know how to do a better job identifying pain and would know how to do a better job 14 16:36:03 15 treating pain. 16 This is the last slide of the series I want 17 to show you but it's really important. 18 This is a statement that comes out in 2001. 19 It's a joint statement from 21 health organizations and 16:36:18 20 the Drug Enforcement Administration. Drug Enforcement 21 Administration's role here is not because it's a health 22 care organization. It's a law enforcement and regulation 23 organization, but they are on board. 24 And here is what they say. They say, 16:36:42 25 "Undertreatment of pain is a serious problem in the

1 United States, including pain among patients with chronic 2 conditions and those who are critically ill or near 3 death. And effective pain management is an integral and 4 important aspect of quality medical care, and pain should be treated aggressively." 16:36:56 5 6 Then they talk about opioid medications 7 specifically. Make sure I can get this right. They say, "For many patients, opioid 8 9 analgesics," analgesics means pain medications. It's not 16:37:17 10 a word you're familiar with. I was not. 11 Opioid analgesics, when used as recommended 12 by established pain management Guidelines, are the most 13 effective way to treat their pain and often the only 14 treatment option that provides significant relief." 16:37:29 15 Okay. This is the Drug Enforcement 16 Administration talking. This is the American Academy of 17 Family Physicians, the American Cancer Society, the 18 American Society of Anesthesiologists. These are not 19 fringe organizations. This is what the mainstream 16:37:42 20 medical community and the DEA are telling doctors, it's 21 what they are telling the public at large, and it's what 22 they're telling pharmacists for that matter. That's what 23 they're telling anyone who will listen. 24 So as you would probably expect, the use of

these medications went up a lot, and it went up quickly.

16:38:00 25

16:39:17 25

16:39:02 20

16:38:43 15

16:38:17 5

16:38:31 10

Something you -- there was a reference to this earlier, but you may have missed it. It went by quickly, the DEA sets quotas for opioid medications.

What that means is that the companies that make these medicines can't just make as much as they want. You know, if you're making cars, you're Ford Motor Company, you can make as many cars as you want. If you can't sell them, that's on you. But you can make them. The Government doesn't care. You can make as many cars as you want.

If you're making opioid medications, you can't make as much as you want. Every year the DEA sets a limit and they say this is the limit for opioid medications that can be made and/or sold in our country. Manufactured, imported, sold.

And the way they do that is the DEA looks at these — this is the language. They look at the medical, scientific research and industrial needs of the United States. They look at what are our needs in our country, how much of these medicines does our country need. They figure out how much they think we need and they say to our manufacturers okay, you can make that much, you can make as much as we need but you can't make more. You can't make and sell more of these medicines, which are addictive, for sure, which can be abused, for

1 sure. You can't make more of those medicines than the 2 DEA says we need. 3 And this is what these quotas look like in 4 much of the time period we're talking about. 16:39:35 5 These are the quotas for Hydrocodone and 6 Oxycodone. And I'm glad Mr. Lanier said those are the 7 two he's going to concentrate on the case because those are the ones we have this data for and it's true, those 8 are the most widely prescribed opioid medications, I 16:39:53 10 believe, in the U.S. 11 Look at what happens to the line. The blue 12 line at the bottom, that's Hydrocodone. That's used in 13 Vicodin, for example. If you've ever seen a Vicodin 14 prescription, the medicine in there is a Hydrocodone. 16:40:09 15 Also has Tylenol. 16 At the beginning of this time period in 17 2000, the quota for Hydrocodone is 20,000 kilograms. That was what they thought we needed. 18 19 In 2006, six years later, the need has 16:40:24 20 doubled according to DEA. More than doubled. It's over 21 40,000 kilograms. 22 By 2013, the need, according to DEA, has 23 doubled again to a hundred thousand kilograms. With 24 Oxycodone, it's even, even starker. Oxycodone is a more 16:40:41 25 powerful opioid than Hydrocodone. It's used in Percocet,

1 also used in OxyContin, which is a slower, slow-release 2 version, and you can buy or your doctor prescribes it for 3 you, there are pills with pure Oxycodone with no other 4 ingredient. This is what DEA concluded about the 16:41:00 5 6 nation's need for Oxycodone. At the beginning of the 7 time period 2000, it was 35,000 kilograms a year. By 2010, it had tripled to a hundred thousand kilograms per 8 year. And by 2013, the number, the need according to 16:41:20 10 DEA, had quadrupled. Now we're up to 150,000 kilograms 11 according to DEA. 12 So where did the pharmacists fit into this 13 story? This is the demand. This is the need according 14 to DEA. Pharmacists don't create the demand. They 16:41:33 15 don't create that need. Pharmacists don't tell doctors 16 17 how many pills to prescribe, which pills to prescribe, 18 for what duration a patient needs treatment. 19 Where pharmacists fit in is by filling 16:41:49 20 prescriptions that doctors write. They do a lot of other 21 things, we're going to talk about some of the other 22 things pharmacists do, but they don't tell doctors which 23 prescriptions to write or how many pills to prescribe.

So that brings us to pharmacists. And I

want to talk a little bit about who pharmacists really

24

16:42:06 25

1 are and what they do. I was so pleased that Giant Eagle 2 brought a pharmacist here so you can see one in the 3 flesh, so to speak. You'll meet some more before the 4 case is done. 16:42:22 5 The pharmacists I want to talk about 6 primarily are the pharmacists who work at Walgreen's. 7 Interestingly enough, this year, Walgreen's is 120 years The very first Walgreen's pharmacy was on the south 8 side of Chicago, and there was a Mr. Charles Walgreen. 16:42:42 10 Mr. Charles Walgreen was a registered pharmacist. He was 11 working in a pharmacy on the south side of Chicago and 12 decided to take out a loan and buy the store from his 13 boss. And that was the first Walgreen's. 14 Today you could find a Walgreen's in every 16:42:57 15 state of the union, plus DC and Puerto Rico. 16 As you may well be familiar with, if you're 17 in the front of the store, front area of the store, you 18 can buy snacks, you can buy toothpaste, baby products, 19 all sorts of things. This time of year, you're probably starting to see Halloween candy, Halloween decorations, 16:43:17 20 21 that sort of thing. 22 There is also a pharmacy at every

Walgreen's. It was originally, Charles Walgreen's was a pharmacist and to this day, there is a pharmacy at every Walgreen's.

Walgreen's.

1 And I was a little surprised to learn this 2 myself, but if that Walgreen's pharmacy is open, this is 3 not unique to Walgreen's, what I'm going to tell you, if 4 that Walgreen's pharmacy is open, there is a Walgreen's pharmacist on duty. You may see other people behind the 16:43:48 5 6 counter. There may be pharmacy technicians, for example, 7 and usually there are, but if the pharmacy is open, could be 2:00 o'clock in the morning at a 24-hour pharmacy, if 8 9 the pharmacy is open, there is a Walgreen's pharmacist on 16:44:04 10 duty. 11 So who are these people? Who are 12 pharmacists? The first thing to say about them is that they are health care professionals. That is their 13 14 self-identity. That is their career. 16:44:19 15 A pharmacist is going to typically between 16 six and eight years of between college and pharmacy 17 schools, and if it's a combined program, sometimes they 18 do two programs, but you're looking at between six and 19 eight years of training. 16:44:33 20 They have had hundreds of hours of 21 practical training before they can sit for the boards to 22 get a license. 23 They have to take a licensing exam. 24 have to pass their licensing exam. And they have to get 16:44:46 25 a license from the Board of Pharmacy, just like this is

1 an Ohio Board of Medicine that regulates and licenses 2 There is the Ohio Board of Pharmacy that 3 regulates and licenses pharmacists. 4 And if a pharmacist isn't doing their job right, if they are dispensing pills when they shouldn't, 16:45:02 5 6 the Board of Pharmacy can take that license away. 7 They also have continuing education requirements to keep up their practice, especially the 8 9 longer they've been out of school. 16:45:20 10 It's an important job, it can be a 11 difficult job, it can be a stressful job. Pharmacists 12 are pretty well paid for it, by and large. A new pharmacist coming out of school in Ohio is probably going 13 14 to make just around \$100,000 a year. Most pharmacists 16:45:36 15 are making somewhere between a hundred and \$130,000 a 16 year in Ohio. 17 As you would expect, there are rules for 18 pharmacists. 19 Like there are rules for what pharmacists 16:45:47 20 do, and there are rules for what they may not do. 21 are both rules, of course. It's important you do the 22 things you're supposed to do. It's also important you 23 don't do the things you're not supposed to do. 24 And what you're going to find out is that

at Walgreen's, pharmacists comply with both kinds of

16:46:02 25

rules.

So let's start with rules for what pharmacists do.

The most important rule for what pharmacists do is they have an obligation for patient care. You go into a pharmacy, you may just think you're a customer. From the pharmacist's point of view, you're a patient. The people they fill prescriptions for are their patients and they have a professional obligation to care for their patients. That means a lots of things, but first and foremost, it means that if you are a pharmacist, your job is to make sure that people who need medicines prescribed by their doctors are able to get the medicines they need.

If you're a pharmacist and you're not doing that, you're not doing your job as a pharmacist. If a doctor refuses to take care of people, you're not doing your job as a doctor. If a pharmacist refuses to help people get prescription medicines that they need, you're not doing your job as a pharmacist.

There are, I should say, a lot of steps a pharmacist takes before filling a prescription. Their job isn't just handing pills across the counter. They're not gum ball machines or anything like that. You're going to hear from pharmacists about all the things they

16:46:14 5

16:46:32 10

16:46:49 15

16:47:05 20

16:47:26 25

1 do when they fill a prescription to make sure that they 2 are filling the right prescription, that they are filling 3 it with the right medicine in the right dose to look out 4 for drug allergies and look out for interactions between 16:47:42 5 drugs. This is where, Mr. Lanier said this and 6 7 it's absolutely true, this is where pharmacists are 8 really specialized. They know a lot more about 9 interactions between drugs and sometimes drug allergies 16:47:54 10 than anybody else. 11 And that is one of the things they are 12 doing to look out for their patients. 13 There's all sorts of things going on like that. 14 16:48:01 15 I hope you didn't have the impression from 16 the presentation earlier that there's all this data about 17 a patient's prescriptions that the pharmacist can't see. 18 I thought I heard that at least implied. 19 When the pharmacist is filling a 16:48:17 20 prescription, they have this, and it shouldn't be 21 surprising, access to the prescription records for that 22 patient. 23 Now, they're filling for Patient A, they're 24 not supposed to dig into Patient B's records but if they 16:48:32 25 are filling for Patient A they are looking at all the

1 other prescriptions that Patient A has filled at 2 Walgreen's. That's not secret information. It's what 3 pharmacists are able to see. 4 When it comes to controlled substances, 16:48:45 5 that's what brings us here. There are extra steps. 6 There's even more a pharmacist is going to do. 7 Controlled substances include opioid medications. That's clear. You should probably know 8 that's not all that counts. You know, Valiums, Xanax, 9 16:49:01 10 those are controlled substances, too. Sleeping 11 medications, Ritalin, Adderall, there are lots of 12 controlled substances out there. Opioid medications are the ones we're going to be talking about most, of course. 13 14 A few things we should talk about at the 16:49:16 15 outset when we think about opioid pain medications. 16 The first one is that most of the time, a 17 doctor has prescribed these medications and they are good 18 doctors doing the right thing. Yeah, there are some bad 19 doctors out there. This is a statement by DEA. I don't 16:49:33 20 think anyone would argue that it's a statement on 21 dispensing controlled substances for pain from 2006. 22 DEA recognizes that the overwhelming majority of American 23 physicians who prescribe controlled substances do so for 2.4 legitimate medical reasons.

Yes, there are times when somebody comes in

16:49:52 25

1 with a bogus prescription. That is not the usual case. 2 The other thing we can't lose sight of is 3 how important these medicines are. People talk about 4 these medicines in sort of a flippant way as if all they do is addict people, all they do is make people sicker. 16:50:11 5 6 These are critically important medicines. 7 Every one of them has been approved by the Food & Drug Administration to treat pain. You can't just make these 8 9 medicines because you feel like it. The drug 16:50:27 10 manufacturers in all cases have gone to FDA and FDA has 11 said, "This is an appropriate medicine to treat pain." 12 And there are people who need these 13 medicines. Sometimes need them desperately. There are 14 people recovering from surgeries who need pain control. 16:50:47 15 There are people who have been in serious accidents who 16 need pain control. There are people in our communities 17 who have a kind of pain from various conditions, they 18 can't get out of bed without their medicine. They can't 19 get out of bed in the morning, they can't hold a job, 16:51:05 20 they can't join their families for an evening meal. 21 Those people need these medicines. 22 And there are, of course, people with 23 horrible pain from cancer. There are people in hospice

near the ends of -- near the end of their lives who would

suffer horribly and unnecessarily if these

24

16:51:20 25

1 pains -- excuse me -- if these medicines weren't 2 available to them. 3 Unfortunately, there are people, there are 4 criminals, oops, there are criminals who will try to trick pharmacists into dispensing these medicines to 16:51:38 5 6 people who don't need them, and they are criminals. 7 These are the major ways that criminals divert people from pharmacists. 8 9 All right. We've had bad doctors. There 16:51:57 10 aren't a lot of them. They exist. You'll probably hear 11 about a couple of them before this trial is over. 12 There are bad doctors who take cash and write prescriptions, no questions asked. Again, very few 13 14 of them thankfully, but they exist. 16:52:11 15 There are people, I don't even want to call 16 them patients, there are criminals who will trick 17 doctors, good doctors, into writing prescriptions they 18 don't need. So that might be somebody who fakes their 19 symptoms, who pretends to be in pain when they're not to 16:52:26 20 get a prescription, or it might be somebody who has a 21 real injury but they go to five different doctors with 22 the same injury to get five prescriptions when they need 23 one. 24 That happens, unfortunately, and that is a

crime. It is absolutely a crime.

16:52:38 25

1 There are cases where criminals have stolen 2 prescription pads. Maybe they had someone on the inside 3 who worked at the Doctor's Office, they steal a 4 prescription pad and write their own prescriptions. 16:52:52 5 Nowadays, this doesn't happen very much 6 because so much prescribing is electronic, but if you go 7 back to 2010, '11, '12, most prescriptions, maybe all prescriptions were written on an old fashioned 8 9 prescription paper pad. 16:53:08 10 The last thing over there, I have people 11 who forge prescriptions. And they have always existed 12 and they will continue to exist. You know, maybe once 13 everything is electronic, you have to be really sophisticated, but that has always been a big problem. 14 16:53:27 15 Because these criminals are out there, 16 there are, of course, steps that pharmacists take to 17 avoid being tricked, to avoid being taken advantage of. 18 None of these are examples where the 19 pharmacist is a criminal. In fact, you're not going to hear about that. You're only going to hear in this case 16:53:43 20 21 about pharmacists who were taken advantage of by a 22 criminal who tricked them, who wanted these meds. 23 So pharmacists, you know, they take steps 2.4 to quard against this. That is part of their 16:53:58 25 professional obligation, too.

1 They learn about this in pharmacy school. 2 You may have thought this is all on-the-job training or 3 something. That's not true. Everybody comes out of 4 pharmacy school knowing about their legal obligations. Mr. Lanier talked about that corresponding 16:54:14 5 6 responsibility. They learn all about the law in pharmacy 7 school, they learn about their corresponding responsibilities, the requirements that they have, and 8 they learn how to identify suspicious, suspicious 16:54:29 10 prescriptions. 11 That's what they are learning about in 12 pharmacy school along with everything else. 13 Now, if they come to Walgreen's, they also 14 need to comply with what Walgreen's calls its good faith dispensing policy. This goes back in different version, 16:54:45 15 16 this version I'm looking at here is from 2012, I believe. 17 This is a Walgreen's policy that every 18 Walgreen's pharmacist has to comply with. First thing we 19 say is you must use the elements of good faith dispensing 16:55:06 20 in conjunction with state and federal laws. This is on 21 top of state and federal law. 22 We tell them that you must comply. We 23 remind them about their corresponding responsibility, and 24 we tell them at the bottom if you don't comply, if you 16:55:19 25 don't do this, if you don't comply with your

16:56:39 25

16:56:23 20

16:56:07 15

16:55:36 5

16:55:51 10

corresponding responsibility obligations, if you don't comply with this policy, you can be disciplined, including terminated, including fired out of a six-figure job for not complying with these rules.

Before the case is over, you are going to get a chance to read this in as much detail as you want.

I'm sure you don't have time today to go through the whole thing, but you will get to see it all, and you'll get to see every version of it you want to see. You will get to read the whole thing.

I just want to hit a couple highlights.

The first thing is procedures. It starts with procedures; things like patient ID, check for ID if you don't know this person. Make sure, make sure the prescriber has a valid license. Mr. Lanier talked about how important that is. We agree, it is important. Check to make sure the prescriber has a valid license. Check the PDMP. Mr. Lanier talked about how important it is to check the PDMP. That's that database and you can find out if someone is filling prescriptions all over town.

We agree. We tell pharmacists check the PDMP.

That thing at the bottom, DUR, that stands for Drug Utilization Review. That is a review that will help you identify drug interactions. A pharmacist is always concerned about is the drug I'm giving someone

going to interact with another drug?

That includes those cocktails you heard about. Cocktails is a drug interaction. That's the reason it's dangerous, these cocktails, because it's a drug interaction. That is part of the DUR, Drug Utilization Review.

Then it goes on and says listen pharmacist, you're a professional, you went to school, you know how to do your job, but here are things you should be looking out for, things you should be considering.

And I've got to say virtually all the red flags, maybe all of them, we'll find out, all the red flags Mr. Lanier identified, the doctor shopping, people writing the same prescription over and over again, people paying cash, they're all in here. It's exactly the things we are telling our pharmacists to look out for.

It doesn't take lawyers to figure that out.

Okay? This is what pharmacists learn in pharmacy school.

This is what Walgreen's has been telling them to do for ages.

And here we get to the end, last stint of the process. If after reviewing the elements of good faith of dispensing, you've got three options: One, dispense. If everything checks out, this person needs their medicine, you need to give them their pills.

16:56:53 5

16:57:06 10

16:57:25 15

16:57:55 25

1 Two, if a doctor says it's not a valid 2 prescription, for example the doctor says that's not my 3 patient, I never heard of this person, you obviously 4 don't fill the prescription. And what I really want to draw your 16:58:07 5 6 attention to is number three. Even if the prescriber, 7 the doctor, informs the pharmacist that a prescription is valid -- so if a doctor says it's A-OK, I want you to 8 fill this, even then, if the pharmacist is not 16:58:24 10 comfortable, the pharmacist determines -- I think my battery went out -- the pharmacist, even then -- I think 11 12 I have to turn this on -- even then, if the pharmacist is 13 uncomfortable, the pharmacist says the elements of good 14 faith -- Jesus, excuse me. Is that better? 16:58:53 15 Even then if the pharmacist is 16 uncomfortable, so someone comes in with a prescription, 17 the doctor says A-OK, I want you to fill this but because 18 of all those red flag-type considerations, the pharmacist 19 is uncomfortable, Walgreen's tells the pharmacist, "You 16:59:09 20 have a responsibility to refuse to dispense. You go 21 ahead and refuse to dispense that prescription and the 22 company will back you up. The company is telling you to 23 do it." 24 What you're going to find out is in real

life examples, this is a policy. Maybe someone's going

16:59:26 25

1 to say that's a policy, who cares, no one pays attention 2 to policies. One, you're going to find out that 3 Walgreen's pharmacists take this policy very seriously. 4 Two, you will see examples of how they apply it in real life. You're going to hear stories and see examples of 16:59:43 5 6 people turning away prescriptions, sometimes over and 7 over. You will see examples like this. This is 8 9 an investigative report, comes out of Lake County. This 16:59:56 10 one goes back to 1998. Remember all this stuff about too 11 little, too late? This is way back in 1998. 12 In 1998, the Lake County Narcotics Agency 13 got a phone call from Melanie Burlinghouse. 14 Ms. Burlinghouse is a registered pharmacist at a Walgreen's in Mentor. She says she has a fraudulent 17:00:13 15 16 prescription. Pharmacist Burlinghouse didn't just call 17 the police. She took the trouble to identify that the 18 people were in a tan station wagon and she went and wrote 19 down the registration number to give to the police to 17:00:30 20 make sure they could catch these folks. 21 Here's another one from years and years 22 later, 2010, a presentence report. This person was being 23 sentenced, how did they end up being arrested, what 24 started the investigation? The pharmacist at Walgreen's 17:00:45 25 contacted Willoughby police in regards to a male and

1	female attempting to pass an altered prescription.
2	That's not a gum ball machine. That is a licensed
3	professional health care provider.
4	So that takes us through what rules for
17:01:06 5	what pharmacists do. Some of the rules. You'll hear
6	more as the case go on.
7	Now, I want to talk to you about rules for
8	what pharmacists may not do.
9	What do they not get to do? The main one I
17:01:21 10	want to talk to you about is that pharmacists may not
11	write prescriptions. Pharmacists may not make
12	prescribing decisions. For the most part, if a
13	pharmacist wrote a prescription, that would be like me
14	writing a prescription. It's against the law.
17:01:36 15	Pharmacists may not write prescriptions
16	because they may not make prescribing decisions.
17	Kind of makes sense. Think about it.
18	Pharmacists have a lot of training, a lot of expertise in
19	the practice of pharmacy, not the practice of medicine.
17:01:54 20	They did not go to medical school. They do
21	not have the clinical training that doctors have,
22	including internships, residencies, sometimes
23	fellowships.
24	Any doctor has to have a medical license
17:02:08 25	from the State of Ohio board of medicine to practice

medicine and write prescriptions. The State of Ohio will take that license away if the doctor is writing bad prescriptions or not practicing properly before a doctor can write prescriptions for controlled substances. On top of that, they have to have a special registration with the DEA. And again, the DEA will suspend that registration and revoke that registration if they are concerned that the doctor is not writing correctly.

What else do doctors do when they see a patient, things that pharmacists can't do? Well, a pharmacist, you could go see a doctor. Your doctor has access to your whole medical history, all of your medical files. If they don't have those files, they could probably get them. They'll talk to you about your medical history, talk to you about your family medical history as well.

A doctor does a physical exam. Right? You go to a doctor, they could do a physical exam, they could talk to you. They could ask you about your symptoms, how long you've had these symptoms, they'll tell you to describe the symptoms and how they've changed.

Doctors can order tests. They will order blood tests, they'll order x-rays, they can order MRIs, all that sort of thing. And at the end of the that process if you are sick or injured or have an issue, a

17:02:44 10

17:02:59 15

17:03:10 20

17:03:23 25

doctor makes a diagnosis.

17:04:35 25

17:04:21 20

17:04:06 15

17:03:36 5

17:03:50 10

Based on everything they know about the patient, based on their expertise, their clinical judgment, they can say, "Okay, I know what's going on with this patient or I have a good guess or I have something we're going to start with and we'll see how it does," but they make a diagnosis.

Pharmacists can't do any of those things and certainly can't, shouldn't diagnose patients.

And after all that is when a doctor writes a prescription. Sometimes it's a quick process and simple. Sometimes it's a long process, a complicated case. But every time a doctor writes a prescription, at the end of the day, they are saying based on everything I know about this patient, based on my clinical judgment, based on my training and expertise, here's what I think is the best medicine option for this patient. Knowing what I think are going to be the benefits for the patient, abusing this medicine and also what are the risks, what are the possible side effects, based on all of that they are making a decision that they think this is the best medicine option for that patient.

Pharmacists can't do any of that.

Where do pharmacists fit in? Where a pharmacist fits in is if somebody comes with that

17:06:06 25

17:05:47 20

17:05:25 15

17:04:51 5

17:05:12 10

prescription and they think the patient is trying to commit a crime of diversion or any crime, they think the patient is trying to commit a crime, and they think the doctor is in cahoots with the patient through writing bogus prescriptions, yeah, in that case absolutely, the pharmacist should refuse to dispense medication.

But what you're going to hear is that in other cases, in every other case, a pharmacist, as part of their professional obligations, cannot, should not, stand between doctors and their patients by second-guessing the doctor's medical decision, just saying I think I know better what's the right pill for this person.

You would never, nobody would ever accept this. The Board of Pharmacy would hear about this. The Board of Pharmacy, anyone else would never accept it if you come to the pharmacy and the pharmacist says, "I know your doctor thinks you should be taking a 30 milligram pill twice a day, but as your pharmacist, I feel I should start you off on ten milligrams and see how you're feeling and come back and see me in two weeks."

So that brings me to the final agenda item.

And I'm going to apologize. I don't mean to be rude

looking at my watch. It is because there is no clock in
this room, I've discovered.

1 But let me finish off on this. And again, 2 this question where do diverted pills in these two 3 counties really come from is critical because at the end 4 of the case, you're going to get instructions on the law 17:06:27 5 from Judge Polster, and one of those instructions is 6 going to be this. So this is going to be one of the 7 things he's going to tell you the plaintiffs need to prove to make out their case. Right? 8 9 They don't make out their case just by

17:06:44 10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

17:07:32 25

17:07:18 20

17:06:58 15

They don't make out their case just by saying, you know, I think there's a lot of blame to go around and the opioid crisis is bad. There are legal requirements that they need to make to make out their case, and one of those is going to be this:

That these pharmacies, each of them individually, not just together, not pharmacies as a world, these pharmacies were a substantial factor. They need to prove that word, were a substantial factor in creating a public nuisance, not in the sense of the opioids crisis generally but a public nuisance of diverted opioid medications in those two counties, diverted opioid medications in these two counties, Lake and Trumbull.

So we need to talk about where do the diverted pills in these two counties really come from.

And in the presentation earlier today we heard very

1 little about the actual counties, about what actually 2 goes on, you know, on the ground in Lake and Trumbull 3 Counties. 4 There were some discussions of Walgreen's acting as a distributor, and you'll hear much more about 17:07:50 5 this later in the case, but it's getting late in the day 6 7 and I want to pick a couple points. The first thing to emphasize you're going 8 to find out, if it wasn't clear already, is that when 9 17:08:05 10 Walgreen's acted as a distributor, it only ever 11 distributed to its own pharmacies. And when I say its 12 own pharmacies I mean pharmacies that are owned by 13 Walgreen's. There's no such thing as a franchise 14 Walgreen's. Sometimes people wonder that. These are 17:08:21 15 pharmacies that are owned by Walgreen's. These are 16 pharmacies run by a pharmacy manager, who is a Walgreen's 17 pharmacist. And they are staffed exclusively by Walgreen's pharmacists who work for the company. 18 19 You've heard a lot about the system of 17:08:38 20 controls that distributors are supposed to have. 21 have to monitor for certain kinds of orders. 22 You're going to hear from this gentleman, 23 Greg Anderson, about that. Greg Anderson is retired

after a 28-year career at the DEA.

I hope you get a chance to hear about some

24

17:08:57 25

of the amazing things that he did during his time at the DEA. He worked at the Detroit field office, which as you saw, includes responsibility for Ohio. He worked in Washington, D.C. at the headquarters, and he worked overseas in Pakistan and other places. He's had a fascinating career.

And he is going to be able to explain to you that at the Walgreen's Distribution Centers, they were always doing what DEA expected them to do at the time. The DEA's expectations. You may conclude that they changed over time, you may not, but he will explain to you, he will explain to you how that works and that Walgreen's was doing what DEA wanted.

You'll hear stories. There's a lot about Florida in all the highlighting that was going on really quickly. There's all these references to Florida.

You're going to hear from Mr. Anderson and others about a Distribution Center in Ohio, in Perrysburg, and you will hear about times when DEA came to the Perrysburg Distribution Center and said, "We want you to make some changes," and Walgreen's made those changes and there was correspondence. It was a cooperative back and forth to make sure that DEA was satisfied with how they were doing business.

The other thing Mr. Anderson is going to be

17:09:33 10

17:09:52 15

17:10:09 20

0.5

17:10:24 25

able to explain to you, and you might hear from some 1 2 others, is that even though Walgreen's stopped 3 distributing back in 2014 -- so what is that, seven years 4 ago now -- even though Walgreen's stopped distributing, those checks and controls to see what kind of orders are 17:10:43 5 6 coming out of pharmacies, Walgreen's still does that. 7 They don't have to. No one ever told them you should. No one ever asked them to. But they still 8 9 have that monitoring system in place to see what orders 17:10:59 10 Walgreen's pharmacies are placing with the new 11 distributor because if there is a problem at a Walgreen's 12 pharmacy, if there is a Walgreen's pharmacy that's 13 placing orders for Oxycodone that don't make any sense 14 for a pharmacy that size or that community, Walgreen's 17:11:18 15 wants to know. 16 They've spent a lot of time and money on 17 that system to make sure that if there's a problem at a 18 Walgreen's pharmacy, Walgreen's is going to know about it 19 and Walgreen's is going to do something about it. 17:11:38 20 I will pull back a little bit to hopefully 21 make it a little easier on the Court Reporter. 22 But let's talk again about diversion, not 23 in Florida, not in other places, but in Lake and Trumbull 24 Counties. What do we really know about where do diverted 17:12:03 25 pills really come from?

1 You're not going to hear any stories in 2 this case, I predict and I'm confident, you're not going 3 to hear any stories about theft out of Walgreen's stores 4 being a big problem, theft out of the Perrysburg distribution or any distribution center being a big 17:12:13 5 6 problem. 7 You're not going to hear about pills that fell off the back of a truck. You're not going hear 8 9 about pharmacists selling pills out of the back door of a 17:12:24 10 pharmacy. Nothing like that. 11 You're not going to hear anyone say, I 12 don't believe, that a Walgreen's pharmacist is a 13 criminal. 14 You are going to hear about other criminals 17:12:39 15 who tricked Walgreen's pharmacists in some occasions; 16 you're going to find out, very, very few. 17 But we've been talking about how criminals 18 divert pills from pharmacies, how they divert pills from 19 pharmacies. The thing I alluded to you early on that you 17:12:58 20 didn't here anything about this morning -- not this 21 morning -- earlier this afternoon, is that most diversion 22 doesn't involve a pharmacy. Most diversion does not 23 involve a pharmacy. It's what they call medicine cabinet 24 diversion. 17:13:13 25 Now, I mentioned this in the beginning when we were looking at the Ohio Task Force report that they identified friends and family as a problem. Let me spend a few minutes on this.

Most pills, most pain pills that are prescribed in America go unused. They go unused, which means they're sitting in medicine cabinets available for someone to take them, a friend, a relative, a plumber, anybody who has access to a medicine cabinet.

These are two studies that have been done. The first study looked at opioid pills prescribed after common dental procedures. They looked at tooth extractions, a relatively common dental procedure that people typically needed some kind of pain control after. The filling, hopefully not, but tooth extraction, you will usually get some kind of pain relief if you want it.

They look at pills prescribed after tooth extractions, and they figured out that 54 percent of them went unused. And the authors of this study did the math, and they figured out that means there are 100 million unused opioid pills per year in America just from tooth extractions. That's a lot of pills.

This next study looked at common outpatient surgical procedures. The study was done at the Dartmouth University Medical Center in Massachusetts. This is a top hospital. These are top doctors at the Dartmouth

17:13:29 5

17:13:52 10

17:14:11 15

17:14:28 20

17:14:52 25

University Hospital, and they looked at the most common outpatient surgical procedures they were doing at this time. They are listed over on this side.

And they found out that 71 percent of the pills went unused or were left in medicine cabinets unless somebody hopefully knew what to do to dispose of it properly. 71 percent. Now, these authors didn't do the math. I suspect the number would be far higher than a hundred million if we're talking about procedures like this, but they didn't give us, they didn't give us that math.

So we got all these pills in medicine cabinets. Unsurprisingly, a lot of them end up in the wrong hands, unfortunately. It's not surprising but it's unfortunate. The Government is studying this question. The Government has asked when people misuse pills, where did they get them. The Government got people who researched this, were very interested in this question. Of all the places you can get a pill, where do people who misuse pills get them? And this is what they discovered.

A 50.5 percent, just over half, got the pills free from a friend or relative, for free from a friend or relative.

Four percent took them without asking from a friend or relative. And then 11 percent bought them,

17:15:07 5

17:15:25 10

17:15:40 15

17:15:58 20

17:16:15 25

17:17:50 25

17:17:29 20

17:17:11 15

17:16:36 5

17:16:48 10

paid the friend or relative. A much smaller number buy them from drug dealers.

It's only those two wedges at the bottom that involve filling a doctor's prescription, that even hypothetically involved a pharmacy. Now that means -- I think it's 25 percent, 25.2 percent if you add up those two wedges.

That's not to say the pharmacist did anything wrong in those cases. The prescription may have been completely legitimate when it was filled or when the person brought it in. They just went on to misuse the pills later. Who knows? We can't say that 25 percent of that -- 25 percent represents a pharmacy doing anything wrong, but those the only misused pills in this study. From a pharmacy rather than a medicine cabinet, from a friend or relative or from a drug dealer.

So in those cases, in those cases which are not that many it turns out, in those cases when criminals doing drug diversion want to go to a pharmacy to get pills, they can't get it from a friend or a relative or they are the supplier, the drug dealer, or they prefer to go, they have a prescription, a bogus prescription, in those cases when those criminals do drug diversion go to a pharmacy, there are a lot of places they can choose to go before going to a Walgreen's.

17:19:18 25

17:18:59 20

17:18:41 15

17:18:07 5

17:18:21 10

Let me show you some of this, and we will

-- or as the case goes on, you'll see sliced and diced,
this information, lots of different ways but you won't be
able to change, you know, don't be afraid of math. You
can do the math different ways. You will get to see the
math done in a lot of different ways, but the conclusions
are always going to be the same.

So this is the market share of the two counties. All four of the pharmacy chains involved in this case, put all four together. Their market share is 37.5 percent. That means more than 60 percent of the opioids being dispensed were being dispensed by other people who are not here with us in court.

Mr. Lanier tried to explain MME, I think he got it roughly right. It's a way to recognize that some pills are much stronger than others. So if you have five milligrams of Vicodin, which is Hydrocodone, and five milligrams of Percocet, which is Oxycodone, that Percocet pill is much stronger.

So usually when people want to look at which pharmacy is dispensing how much, they want to take into account how strong the pills are. So for that reason, they tend to talk about MMEs, that a lot of them take into account that one pharmacy may be dispensing the same number of pills as another pharmacy, but much, much

stronger pills. And if you're concerned about comparing pharmacies, depending on what you're trying to figure out, it's a pretty wordy question, are you dispensing lots of very small pills that people tend to use after a dental procedure, or lots of very, very strong pills that are rarely used, much more rarely used and much more attractive to criminals. People involved in diversion are more interested in diverting these strong pills with more of the drug than tons and tons of weak pills.

Who are that 62 percent? Who are we

Who are that 62 percent? Who are we talking about? Well, there are 143 pharmacy, clinic and hospital locations in the two counties that fill opioid prescriptions.

This is undercounting in a way. This is only pharmacies, clinics and hospitals. If you get down to individual doctors, some individual doctors dispense significant amounts. If you get down to doctors and dentists, vets, people like that, you'd be giving hundreds and hundreds and hundreds.

Here, looking only at pharmacy, clinic and hospital locations that dispense, there are 143 of them.

And 13 are Walgreen's pharmacies.

And even if you included all of the pharmacy chains in this case, it's 45. Of 143 places to dispense opioids, every one in this lawsuit, 45; 98 other

17:19:58 10

17:19:36 5

17:20:16 15

17:20:32 20

17:20:55 25

places you can go.

17:22:29 25

17:22:08 20

17:21:52 15

17:21:10 5

17:21:35 10

What are some of those other places you might go? There are many, many. I just to want talk for a minute about these three.

First one you see there is a place called Franklin Pharmacy. It's still there. Franklin Pharmacy is in Trumbull County. As you can see, it is physically a relatively small store. And if you include, if you look at how much dispensing goes on at Franklin Pharmacy compared to Walgreen's pharmacies, Franklin Pharmacy is five times busier than the busiest Walgreen's pharmacy in all of Trumbull County.

That little store is dispensing five times as many opioids as the busiest Walgreen's in the entire county.

The one in the middle is called Overholt's.

I know you can see this, but that's the same building.

If you notice, Overholt's and Champion Medicine Shoppe is actually the same.

The reason they changed names is that

Mr. Overholt lost his license, the Board of Pharmacy.

The police shut down Overholt's Pharmacy. Mr. Overholt was arrested, the other pharmacists were arrested.

Mr. Overholt has pled guilty to five counts of criminal drug trafficking.

1 The only reason he is not in jail is 2 because of his -- there is a well known pill mill doctor 3 in the area. His name was Peter Franklin. No 4 connection, as far as I know, to Franklin Pharmacy. He 17:22:48 5 was never prosecuted because he was murdered by his wife, 6 unfortunately, during the investigation. But Dr. Peter 7 Franklin, this well-known pill mill doctor, he used to write prescriptions. He would write on prescriptions 8 9 "Fill only at Overholt's." 17:23:05 10 He didn't want his patients showing up at 11 Walgreen's or around these other pharmacies where the 12 pharmacist was likely to call the police, at least not 13 his questionable prescriptions. He may have written 14 other prescriptions that he wasn't so worried about. "Fill only at Overholt's." 17:23:24 15 16 Champion next door is what the new owners 17 called it. I believe it's closed today. So knowing that, knowing that there are so 18 19 many other places in these counties where a criminal can 17:23:42 20 get involved in diversion, knowing that, why do the 21 lawyers say that these criminals involved in diversion go 22 to Walgreen's? What does the evidence show us? 23 We're going to talk about three things and 24 this will be the last thing I talk about. The first is 17:24:00 25 the red flag theory, and there are all these

prescriptions that trigger a red flag.

Now, the fact that a prescription had a quote, unquote, red flag, paying cash, for example, that doesn't mean it's a crime. Like some people pay cash for the very understandable reason that they don't have prescription drug coverage. Pay cash, might be an issue. Might not.

Any one of those red flags might be an issue, might not be.

But the red flags, what they did, they take these red flags and say, okay, let's apply a computer program. Everyone who pays cash, red flag. Every prescription where someone drove 25 miles to see a doctor, boom, red flag. Every time a doctor wrote the same prescription more than X many times, boom, red flag. And sure enough, you do it that way, you get a lot of red flags.

You get a lot of red flags because you are using a computer program and completely ignoring that pharmacists are licensed professionals expected, required to use their professional judgment when they look at their prescription and decide if they have a concern about it or not.

And sure enough, these red flags make no sense when you apply it the way they have.

17:24:33 10

17:24:19 5

17:25:42 15

17:26:02 20

17:26:20 25

1 For example, one of their, one of their 2 favorite red flags is somebody who drove 25 miles to see 3 the doctor or to go to the pharmacist. Everyone in 4 Trumbull County who went to see a specialist at the 17:26:38 5 Cleveland Clinic drove more than 25 miles. That's not That's not suspicious. That's not even 6 7 interesting. Think how many people drive to work either 8 9 to a job site on one day or to their regular office, 17:26:54 10 drive more than 25 miles and prefer to fill a prescription near work than at home because of the hours 11 12 that they are working. That's not unusual by itself. 13 Now, if someone shows up from Cincinnati for no reason, yeah, you might want to ask why is that 14 17:27:12 15 person in Trumbull County from Cincinnati and they can't 16 explain it. 17 Another one is doctors who repeatedly write 18 the same prescription. Now, when Dr. Franklin wrote the 19 same prescription over and over again, maybe that was 17:27:24 20 cause for a concern. I'm not going to argue with that. 21 But other doctors who write the same prescription over 22 and over again are, for example, dentists. 23 Most dentists will tell you that everyone 24 who gets a root canal who wants a pain pill, they leave

with the same two-day prescription, three-day

17:27:42 25

prescription for pain relief. That dentist is not writing different prescriptions for every person.

Orthopedic surgeons, people who do knee surgeries, it is very common that everyone who gets the same knee procedure leaves the surgery with the same prescription for short-term pain relief. It's not unusual, it's not even interesting.

The red flag doesn't show you anything about any actual diversion in the two counties. It tells you about a huge number of prescriptions that conceivably, maybe, we don't know, could have been involved in diversion.

Next is Mr. James Rafalski. James Rafalski was a diversion investigator at the DEA. He spent his entire career with the Drug Enforcement Administration doing exactly what this case is about: Investigating the diversion of prescription drugs. That's what he did.

Now, he works for the lawyers. We are told he is going to come and testify. You will hear from him directly.

If you really thought, if somebody really thought there was diversion going on at a Walgreen's store, Mr. Rafalski is the guy you would ask. He is the guy you would think of asking. Take a look, is there any diversion going on? Nobody asked him.

17:27:58 5

17:28:19 10

17:28:39 15

17:28:59 20

17:29:16 25

1 You are going to find out that nobody asked 2 Mr. Rafalski and he didn't look. He is not aware of a 3 single prescription, a single prescription diverted from 4 a Walgreen's in Lake or Trumbull County, although again, 17:29:35 5 if there is somebody in this case at least working for 6 the plaintiffs' lawyers, we would expect to go out and 7 figure that out, you think we'd hear about it from Mr. Rafalski. 8 9 On the plus side, there are working 17:29:49 10 diversion investigators you are going to hear from, 11 people who don't work for lawyers, people who have spent 12 their careers out in the field in Lake and Trumbull 13 Counties and elsewhere in northern Ohio looking for 14 diversion. 17:30:03 15 You will hear from Lake County law 16 enforcement, Trumbull County law enforcement, they have 17 never investigated or arrested a Walgreen's pharmacist 18 who they thought was doing diversion. 19 You're going to hear from inspectors with the Board of Pharmacy. The Board of Pharmacy doesn't 17:30:16 20 21 just license pharmacists. I talked about that earlier. 22 The Board of Pharmacy inspects pharmacies. 23 They come to pharmacies on a regular basis and inspect 2.4 pharmacies and they look for signs that the pharmacy is

involved in diversion. That's what they want to know.

17:30:32 25

1 And you're going to find out that they have 2 never had that concern about a Walgreen's pharmacy. 3 And sure enough, they will write up 4 pharmacies for an infraction. If they see something at a 17:30:46 5 Walgreen's pharmacy that they don't like, that they think 6 isn't up to code, they will write it up, and they've 7 never had any concerns about diversion. Last thing I want to talk to you about is 8 9 the data. This is the math that Mr. Lanier is worried 17:31:06 10 about. This is the math. This is the data. This is 11 hard evidence. Okay? There are a lot of people that say 12 a lot of things, what they think, give a lot of opinions. 13 This is hard evidence. 14 What we wanted to do is we wanted to figure 17:31:25 15 out what does Walgreen's look like if you compare it to a 16 real pill mill? We know pill mills exist. We know that 17 there was one in Trumbull County. Overholt's that I 18 talked about. 19 What happens when you look at the data, 17:31:37 20 when you look at the real numbers and you compare 21 Overholt's and other high-volume pharmacies to 22 Walgreen's? And what you will see is they look nothing 23 like each other. 24 So this is shipments to the pharmacies. 17:31:53 25 This is what these pharmacies were ordering because they

1 needed -- the pills they were ordering so that they could 2 dispense to patients. 3 Over on the far left, you see Overholt's. 4 This is measured in MMEs. Again, you could do this with 17:32:11 5 dosage units, although you wouldn't be capturing. If you 6 did dosage units, what you'd miss is the fact that 7 Overholt's loved to dispense 80-milligram OxyContin, the strongest most dangerous dose of OxyContin. At 8 Walgreen's, they dispensed a lot of 5 milligram pills for 17:32:33 10 people who had dental procedures. But you could do it 11 any way you want. 12 Overholt's and Champion, the new owner, 13 we've had this data for 2006 and 2014. I want to assure 14 you that's not cherry-picking, that's all the years we have the data for. If we had more years, we would give 17:32:44 15 16 it to you, four more years. 17 Overholt's and Champion, 278 million. 18 Franklin, that's the little store I showed you on the 19 corner, Franklin is 248 million. These are not 17:33:02 20 cherry-picked. These are every Walgreen's in Trumbull 21 County. Every single Walgreen's in Trumbull County. 22 You could add these up together, pile them 23 all up, it would still be lower than the Franklin number. 24 Here's another one. This is cash payments. 17:33:20 25 You heard Mr. Lanier talk about cash payments as a red

1 flag, something to be worried about. And sure enough, 2 when people are doing diversion, they often pay cash. 3 They don't use Blue Cross. When people pay cash, it 4 could be diversion. It could be that they don't have prescription drug coverage. 17:33:38 5 This is what the numbers look like. 6 7 Overholt's, when they dispense opioids, 27 percent of the 8 time people were paying cash. Champion, the new owners who took over after Mr. Overholt got arrested, almost 17 17:33:56 10 percent. Franklin is a lot lower, 8.5 percent. 11 nearest Walgreen's, this is not a cherry-picked 12 Walgreen's, it was about five, six miles away, we said 13 let's pick the nearest Walgreen's, the one that is most 14 likely to see the same customers. The nearest 17:34:14 15 Walgreen's, 4.3 percent. 16 As the case goes on, you will see lots more 17 charts and graphs like this, probably more than you want 18 to see. This is just a selection of the type of evidence 19 you are going to be presented. 17:34:29 20 When this all comes together, I think you 21 will conclude that yeah, there is diversion going on in 22 Trumbull County. Sure there is, but no evidence that it 23 is at Walgreen's. 24 So let me wrap up. 17:34:44 25 I will repeat what I said at the beginning

1 because it's important and I want you -- I want to make 2 sure that everyone understands. 3 Nobody here, nobody in this room, certainly 4 nobody in Walgreen's is going to tell you that the opioid 17:35:06 5 crisis isn't serious, that it hasn't ruined lives, that it hasn't taken lives. Nobody will tell you that. 6 7 Nobody is going to say that there isn't a lot of blame to go around. Before this case is over, you 8 9 are going to hear about criminal drug gangs that 17:35:27 10 trafficked heroin up from Mexico. You're going to hear 11 about that. 12 You're going to hear about illicit Fentanyl 13 coming from China. Illicit Fentanyl is that super, super 14 strong opioid that gets mixed in with heroin sometimes 17:35:40 15 that has caused so many overdoses. 16 You're going to hear about drug gangs 17 trafficking pills from out of state. You will hear about 18 a drug gang trafficking pills up from Florida. You are 19 going to hear about heroin dealers, heroin dealers who

17:35:57 20

21

22

23

24

17:36:11 25

communities.

You are going to hear about criminals who fake their symptoms to get good doctors to write prescriptions. You are going to hear about doctors who became criminals, doctors who violated their oaths, who

prey on some of the most desperate people in our

1 took money to write fake prescriptions. 2 But at the end of the case, I'm confident 3 that of all the ways people get pills for illegal 4 diversion, of all the ways they get illegal drugs in Lake 17:36:37 5 and Trumbull Counties, you are not going to hear any 6 evidence that persuades you they do it by going to 7 Walgreen's. That's what I have. I want to thank you 8 9 for listening to me. I will ask you at the end of what 17:36:53 10 is already a long afternoon, I can't tell you how much I 11 appreciate it. My colleagues appreciate it, everyone in 12 this room appreciates the time you have given to this 13 case and the attention you have given to this case. 14 And no one appreciates that more than my 17:37:08 15 client and the pharmacists at Walgreen's. 16 Thank you so much. 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, 18 Mr. Stoffelmayr. 19 All right. We will break for the day, 17:37:20 20 ladies and gentlemen. Again do not read, review, 21 consider anything in the media about this case. There 22 may be something. If so, ignore it. 23 Do not discuss this case with anyone, you 24 know, family members, friends. Say this mean Judge has

ordered me not to discuss this case, talk about it until

17:37:38 25

1 it's over. 2 Have a good evening, and we'll pick up 3 promptly at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. 4 (Jury out.) THE COURT: Okay. Everyone can be seated 17:38:28 5 6 for a minute. Just a couple things I want to pick up. 7 First, why -- Sue, if you can get someone with IT to work on things before court because I want you 8 to be able to hear. I don't know if the problem is some 17:38:42 10 sort of interference with this screen, if it was the 11 mics, but it's important that you be able to hear. 12 So if you can work that out with IT before 13 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Second, I want to take up the problem that 14 Special Master Cohen was having. I spent a lot of time 17:39:00 15 16 with him yesterday about these objections to questions 17 and answers in the deposition excerpts that people want 18 to play. 19 Look, the simplest thing for me to do, and I thought of doing it and I still might, is just say 17:39:21 20 21 forget the whole exercise, we're not going to have any 22 depositions played. Jurors tune it out anyway. Everyone 23 will testify either live in court or live by video and 24 from some lawyer's office around the country. 17:39:39 25 That's simple. The jurors are going to pay

1	a lot more attention to it, so maybe we should just do
2	that. And I'm putting it out now for suggestion.
3	So what does everyone think about that?
4	Because we're not going to continue to do what went on
17:39:56 5	over the weekend. That isn't going to happen.
6	MR. LANIER: Your Honor, plaintiffs would
7	be great with that.
8	THE COURT: All right. How about the
9	defendants? It just may be simpler and easier.
17:40:07 10	Because most of these, most of these
11	objections are going to I mean, first of all, if it's
12	done live, forget it. I'm not going to allow someone to
13	ask a compound question, two or three questions at once.
14	If it's hearsay, it's out. All right? If
17:40:22 15	there's a problem with the document, I guess I'll have to
16	deal with it on the fly.
17	I mean, again, if we're I mean I'm going
18	to charge the time to someone if I've got to interrupt
19	testimony.
17:40:35 20	MS. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, Diane Sullivan
21	for Giant Eagle.
22	I hadn't been involved, Your Honor, in the
23	deposition process and the objections but one concern I
24	have about doing what Your Honor suggests is that there
17:40:46 25	are third-party witnesses who are out of our control.

1 Some of them work for the Government and they are in the 2 can, and I think it's appropriate under the Federal Rules 3 that we be able to play those if they're available to us. 4 THE COURT: Well, Ms. Sullivan, I'm not saying it's inappropriate. I mean it's certainly used 17:41:02 5 6 but if the procedure -- the procedure isn't working. All 7 right? People have, you know, put in rafts of objections and in a manner that Special Master Cohen couldn't deal 8 9 with it. So we're not doing that anymore. 17:41:14 10 So if it can't be streamlined so that it 11 can be dealt with efficiently, then it's going to be the 12 other way. And I suggest everyone notify these witnesses 13 now that they're -- they may have to come in or testify 14 live at a lawyer's office in their hometown, all right, 17:41:31 15 at some facility. 16 Yes, Mr. Delinsky? 17 MR. DELINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 I just ask that you give us at least 19 overnight for all defendants to confer. 17:41:46 20 THE COURT: All right. You can confer but 21 I'm making it clear if, if the next deposition that 22 Special Master Cohen has to review has the same problems 23 as the one he reviewed over the weekend, I don't care 24 what anyone says, I'm doing it. 17:42:00 25 Okay? So you're all on notice. Whatever

1 you're giving him tonight, if, if it's like over the 2 weekend, don't do it. 3 Okay? Don't do it. It's over. If you can 4 do it in a way that he can deal with it expeditiously, 17:42:15 5 okay. All right. 6 No bluff. I mean, people know me. This is 7 it. You don't like it, appeal it. But I -- but what was 8 being done was totally improper. 9 So it's really all up to you. 17:42:30 10 MR. STOFFELMAYR: Judge, I'm only 11 tangentially familiar with these issues but I will assure 12 you that we will make sure that message gets back to the 13 people who have been working on this. 14 THE COURT: All right. They may be fine 17:42:43 15 lawyers but this isn't law school, this isn't Moot Court. 16 This is show time, and we don't do it this 17 I couldn't care less about leading questions or 18 compound questions. If the witness answered the 19 question, that moots it. Okay? Okay? If the witness 17:42:59 20 said I don't understand the question, so 99 percent of 21 this stuff is irrelevant. If you've got a real serious 22 objection, first of all, if the witness was asked for 23 privileged information, guess what? One of these fine 24 lawyers would have said "Objection, don't answer it." 17:43:13 25 So, okay, anything serious, it wouldn't

1	have been answered.
2	So it's up to you. If you can do it and
3	streamline it and eliminate about 90 percent of what
4	you've asked him to do and do it in a format, in a way
17:43:27 5	that he can address it, fine. If not, we're done with it
6	and you'll just have to either just put in the
7	depositions as they are, questions and the answers, or
8	we'll have to do everyone live.
9	Okay. All right. Have a good evening and
17:43:47 10	I'll see everyone Mr. Delinsky?
11	MR. DELINSKY: I don't want to be the
12	person standing in the way of everyone going home but
13	very briefly, Your Honor, today was the first time we
14	heard some of the uses Mr. Lanier intended and plaintiffs
17:44:01 15	intended to put to certain documents.
16	I just want to be clear on the record that
17	we've entered evidentiary objections to particular uses
18	of documents. We didn't interrupt Mr. Lanier.
19	I want to be crystal clear that we will be
17:44:15 20	asserting those objections, and we have not waived them
21	by not interrupting.
22	THE COURT: You haven't waived anything.
23	MR. DELINSKY: Okay. Thank you, Your
24	Honor.
17:44:22 25	And then my only my second, second issue

1	I'd like to raise is Mr. Lanier raised one assertion of
2	law. There's obviously wide disagreement on what the law
3	is.
4	But there was one in particular that I
17:44:34 5	think we're all in agreement on, and that the insinuation
6	was incorrect, and that is that he made the suggestion
7	that the requirements of the CSA are different for chains
8	than they are for small pharmacies. And that's not the
9	case.
17:44:50 10	The regulations are the regulations.
11	THE COURT: All right. I didn't hear him
12	say that the law is somehow different. Okay.
13	MR. DELINSKY: He said the
14	responsibility
17:44:59 15	THE COURT: Well
16	MR. DELINSKY: is greater on the
17	larger
18	THE COURT: Well, this is Mr. Lanier's
19	editorial remark that a larger company has as a market
17:45:10 20	leader or whatever.
21	The law doesn't impose any difference on
22	Walmart, Walgreen's, CVS or Giant Eagle than a mom and
23	pop. And if one of you want to say that, you can say
24	that and that's fine because it's right.
17:45:28 25	So I I didn't take it that way but I can

	1	see that someone could have heard it and I suggest one of
	2	you get up and correct that and you've got three chances,
	3	you know, you don't all have to say it tomorrow but
	4	someone, someone should say it and it's a correct
17:45:43	5	statement of the law.
	6	MR. DELINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
	7	THE COURT: Okay. All right. We're
	8	adjourned.
	9	Thank you.
17:45:54	LO	(Proceedings concluded at 5:45 p.m.)
-	11	
-	12	CERTIFICATE
-	13	I certify that the foregoing is a correct
-	L 4	transcript from the record of proceedings in the
-	15	above-entitled matter.
-	L 6	
-	L7	
-	18	
-	L9	/s/Susan Trischan /S/ Susan Trischan, Official Court Reporter
2	20	Certified Realtime Reporter
2	21	7-189 U.S. Court House
2	22	801 West Superior Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44113
2	23	(216) 357–7087
2	24	
2	25	